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Abstract: The problem of preservation of cultural heritage and its positioning in the media is very complicated, despite the apparent simplicity and clarity. Cultural heritage in the modern world is not only a factor in the preservation of cultural memory, but also the political and economic capital. The paper shows how many objects of cultural heritage, being between the Scylla of authenticity, declared by UNESCO and the Charybdis of consumerization necessary for their maintenance, are increasingly being turned into a kind of simulacrum. The authors give a typology of cultural heritage of simulacra and analyze their role in the preservation of cultural memory. Based on the analysis of the domestic and foreign press and internet sources, the article shows the role of the media in Europe and in Russia at the decision on whether to retain the authenticity of the monument, or turn it into a simulacrum or destroy it. Particular attention was paid to the political and ideological base of the development of national priorities on the issue of cultural heritage preservation. All these aspects are reflected in the national media.
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INTRODUCTION

The problem of preserving cultural heritage and its positioning in the media is very complex, despite its apparent simplicity and clarity. It's clear that cultural heritage is an asset of the nation and state, the pride of every citizen, the object of tourism industry and as such is very interesting for the media. It is also an industry that gives jobs to a sufficient number of people. Since the U.S. announced a program to restore the "main street" of small towns in Virginia, it received private investment of more than 55 million dollars [1, 22], primarily because a huge tax rebate was allowed. This has created nearly 13,000 jobs in the region. Due to the versatility and flexibility of cultural heritage, it is often the subject of media interest. Moreover, it would seem, a secondary issue - the nature of covering the situation of the cultural heritage in the media - is actually a very important moment in its future. The very existence of cultural heritage, at least in Russia, very often depends on the directionality of publications and activity campaign in the press and the Internet.

However, as every coin, this problem has a flip side. And it is very multifaceted.

First, the cultural heritage in themselves constitute an existential value, as they are materialized memory of mankind. From this standpoint, the main task of society is to preserve their authenticity and protect them from any external influence.

Second, the economics of modern society which turns these objects into the stem the tourism industry, considers their economic attractiveness to be their main value. And in the place of their true preservation comes unrestrained exploitation and commercialization of these objects. In the world there is almost no cultural heritage sites in one form or another that are not included in this turnover.

This destroys the already ancient substance of many material objects of cultural heritage. When they are turned into a museum, the permissible amount of tourists is often not properly calculated, especially in Russia.

Even people living in etno-villages that are not pure show for tourists, such as, for example, settlements of Amish in the U.S. where visitors allowed at certain times and its inhabitants continue to live their lives without paying attention to the curious visitors, are already calling for the closure of them to tourists. But even for intangible
cultural heritage, which, apparently, does not factor in depreciation, the economic exploitation brings damages, because the show for tourists begins to crowd out the real tradition. No wonder the ceremony of Gelede carnival in Benin, Nigeria, Togo, was included in the register of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, precisely because people are afraid of its "emasculating" in the face of threats of tourism.

On the other hand, the tourists themselves exhibit "wonders of vandalism" in an attempt to take away a souvenir piece of the monument, take a picture of it in spite of technological restrictions. So, increasingly, cultural tourism starts to operate a form of cultural "simulacrum", a remake, a copy, which is not afraid of the big tourist flows and claims polyfunctionality.

Survey Methodology: The main hypothesis of the paper is that the notion of authenticity of cultural heritage is a very complex and diverse phenomenon. Very often it is influenced by a variety of scientific and ideological message. In this regard, the authors undertook the most diverse analysis of the concept. Phenomenological analysis was conducted of the terms of authenticity and a simulacrum. Epistemology of these terms provided an opportunity to build their perception of the boundaries within a particular cultural paradigm. For this purpose, we carried out a content analysis of the legal framework in some countries with regard to cultural heritage, as well as analysis of public discourse in the media, reflecting the problem of cultural heritage preservation. Particular attention was paid to the political and ideological base of the development of national priorities on the issue of cultural heritage preservation. All these aspects are reflected in the national media.

The Original or a Simulacrum - Two Perspectives: In the twentieth century on the initiative of UNESCO cultural heritage has been institutionalized in the world. In parallel, it is legitimated, organized, ranked and defended by a number of conventions and charters [2] and finally became a brand. The abundance of monuments and the complexity of their preservation prevented almost any state in the world to take care of the whole totality of their cultural heritage in a dignified manner. Therefore, the hierarchy of built cultural heritage sites would fix the value of the object in the global cultural system and thus would indicate the extent necessity for the world community to protect it. The establish hierarchy of World Heritage objects, as well as public registries in each country - (in Russia it is federal, state and municipal lists of sites to be protected), promoted commercialization of cultural heritage.

Preserving cultural heritage is no longer a "private affair" of each state, it has become a matter of civil society, because the procedure of inclusion is a long and fairly tedious process requiring a public debate and fulfillment of a variety of conditions associated not only with the condition of the monument itself, but the cultural landscape as well. This is carried out in Western countries using carrots and sticks policy. [3, 43] And one of the most important issues of this procedure is the question of the authenticity of the monument. The guidelines for the implementation of the Convention for the Protection of World Heritage on February 2, 2005, is devoted entirely to the integrity and / or authenticity of the monuments. Following the requirements of authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is allowed only in exceptional circumstances. Reconstruction is acceptable only if they are based on a complete and thorough documentation, but not in any way on the assumptions of any degree of certainty "[4].

I must say, the question of authenticity of a cultural object is not so simple and straightforward. It should be noted that the cultural tradition of preservation of monuments of material cultural heritage is not common to all states and societies. Because European culture is so extravert, it initially focused on the identification of a cultural heritage monument to its material component. Such a trend is consolidate by the term «testimony» used in the middle of last century in the English-language literature, which was later changed into the term «heritage» [5], which expanded the understanding of cultural heritage. As a consequence, the initial system of preservation and protection of cultural heritage sites focuses primarily on material objects and therefore takes into account the mass of material factors: the degree of preservation, the level of depreciation, economic and social risks, human factors, etc.

In the Eastern tradition of cultural heritage preservation, in Japan for instance, the main emphasis is not on the material object, but on its spiritual component. Eastern culture is trying to save not only mortal shell, but the spirit of the monument. M. Vecchio believes that this is connected with the cultural specifics of the philosophical vision of history [6, 322]. But according to
Tomaszewski, the two approaches are derived not only from different religious premises that are part of the culture of each country, but also from the environment. Western monuments are made mainly of resistant materials and in temperate climates and eastern of the unstable and less favorable conditions, that can be destroyed so easily [7, 9].

Now we will set a couple of questions and try to answer them. So what is it that is important in a cultural heritage object - its genuine material envelope, which is wont to grow old and decay, or its content, spirit, a kind of «alter ego», hypothetically able to exist outside of this shell, for example, in virtual form? And is there a sense in asking such a question or it's pure sophistry? In ontological terms, it is the question of authenticity of the object. In terms of methodology, it is the issue of "restoration-reconstruction" dichotomy.

The term authenticity is also treated ambiguously. In Western science there is a distinction between two adjacent concepts - "authenticity of an object" and "existential authenticity". The second term is widely used in research in the field of cultural tourism. [8] I must say that since MakKenal [9] introduced the notion of "authenticity" as the alleged reason for tourism activities, disputes relating to the use of the term only increased.

The "authenticity of an object" actually refers to the authenticity of the object in the European interpretation, when we are not talking about reconstruction, but only about the restoration, in which the object and cultural landscape of the era are preserved as well as possible. Existential authenticity is a concept which is wider and more diffuse than the eastern version of spiritual authenticity. In the Eastern tradition there is yeat a certain authenticity reduplicated in copies made in extreme close-ups to the original. Then it saves (and not recreates) the spirit of genuine cultural object. Existential authenticity is much more broad and not based on the restoration and reconstruction:

"Existential authenticity, unlike [the] object-related version, can often have nothing to do with the issue of whether toured objects are real. In search of [a] tourist experience which is existentially authentic, tourists are preoccupied with an existential state of Being activated by certain tourist activities” [10, 359].

As objects of cultural heritage are involved into a worldwide tourist "web", then the question of historical authenticity begins to give way to actually quite pragmatic concepts - the entertainment and commercial success. The concept of "existential authenticity" relates first of all to the new cultural phenomenon like film tourism, when the storyline of a cult film becomes a tourist route, for example New Zealand, where "Lord of the Rings " was shot [11].

Existential authenticity is seen in "tourism festival" as well, which includes traditional venue of the carnival (Venice, Brazil, etc.), but is not associated with an authentic cultural landscape, such as, for example, Texas Renaissance Festival. Through expert interviews the participants of the festival, H. Kim and T. Jamal revealed that they relate to their participation in this event very seriously, not treating it as a substitute and are totally immersed in the atmosphere of the era, despite the lack of object authenticity [12, 181]. Therefore, the so-called "existential authenticity" is more important for them and the impressions experienced in the process they regard as genuine. Because of this replacing of the material authenticity by existential authenticity a simulacrum comes into the existence.

The concept of "simulacrum" (from the French "a stereotype, a pseudo-thing, a blank form) was introduced into science by Jean Baudrillard and was widely used thereafter, especially in the post-modern philosophy, which elevates it to Plato, his theory of ideas, marking the boundary between the "thing "as such and its images, the original and the copy, the model and the simulacrum. [13,226] Plato admits the existence of two types of copies - original with a resemblance to the original and false, that has no such similarity. "Copy is an image secured by its likeness, while simulacrum is an image devoid of similarity "[14, 231]. However, a simulacrum for Plato is not primarily what it is - a false copy, but that which "calls into question all sorts of images, copies and models ". [15, 229], by its very existence it discredits the concept of the copy.

For Baudrillard the simulacrum is "substituting the signs of the real for the real, that is to say of an operation of deterring every real process via its operational double, a programmatic, metastable, perfectly descriptive machine that offers all the signs of the real and shortcircuits all its vices" [16].

The Russian dictionary "Cultural studies of twentieth century," simulacrum is defined as the image of the missing fact, a plausible likeness, devoid of the original, surface object, beyond which there is no reality. This is a blank form, a self-referential sign, an artifact that is based solely on its own reality [17].
The notion of the simulacrum evolves from a false copy to approximate, sometimes surreal simulation, a virtual copy; the use of this term in relation to any object becomes a pejorative term, identifying subject as one of forgery. This term is increasingly used by various researchers to analyze processes taking place in different areas - in the economy [18], communication theory [19] and so on. It is increasingly used in political discourse [20], is related to mass media and advertising, the later being is literally built on simulacra, no less than modern media.

Jean Baudrillard in a deep philosophical survey regarded all the modern culture as a simulacrum and singled out three orders of simulacra:

"Three orders of simulation, parallel to mutations in the law of value, have succeeded one another since the Renaissance:

- The counterfeit is the dominant scheme of the "classical" epoch, from the Renaissance to the industrial revolution.
- Production is the dominant scheme of the industrial era.
- Simulation is the dominant scheme of the present phase of history, governed by the code. Simulacra of the first order play on the natural law of value; those of the second order play on the commodity law of value; and those of the third order play on the structural law of value." [21, 120].

Contemporary Media Culture breaks boundaries and creates a world of cultural simulacra, that has a complex structure. Cross-border simulacra emerge, together with public cultural simulacra, simulacra of cultural objects, simulacra of ethnic culture, simulacra of democratic political culture and so on.

Media culture allows to create virtual simulacra, which supersedes the real objects of culture, being more attractive and accessible. Modern technology allows not only to improve their aesthetic appearance and to reconstruct the lost parts, but to include them in a media culture to build a parallel cultural "world - a simulacrum." It has characteristics of both multinational and national features.

We are speaking now about cultural simulacrum and its media existence. The spread of cultural simulacra makes us think about the prospects of the existence of tangible cultural heritage.

Based on the concept of "simulacrum," the question arises, how to draw a distinction between simulacrum and original. It would seem that everything is quite simple. The original of this is an absolutely authentic thing, dating from the era to which it belongs, in most cases subjected to restoration, the true basis of which was not changed. However, it is not so easy. Shinto temples Nai-ku and Gay-guw in Ise (Japan), dismantled and rebuilt again according to some sources every 21 years, [22] and according to the others - after 20 years [23, 323], is a replica of the previous one and, accordingly, of the initial the temple. Such restructuring was accomplished over 60 times and the next will be in 2013. Can we consider this monument authentic? It is authentic and not-authentic at one and the same time. This is an absolute likeness of the original, but if you stick to the letter - not the original. The Japanese consider it authentic, because it keeps the spirit of the original temple.

Another example is the Museum of the merchant Tetyushinov in the city of Astrakhan, Russia. It is a wooden house built in the nineteenth century, in the twentieth century it was a dwelling house for a few families and in the beginning of the twenty-first century it fell into disrepair, the tenants were evicted and the house was preserved because of its poor condition. While recent reconstruction works were being done, the basement of the building was preserved, a number of structural elements were reconstructed, but the precious wall of plate panels was destroyed. And the monument, preserving its true authentic foundation, apparently began to look as a "remake", but yet it gained attraction for tourists.

The complexity of determining the authenticity lies in the fact that almost every material object of cultural heritage, having at the moment "marketability" in varying degrees has been restored at one time or another. Moreover, many of them are in the process of their own, sometimes centuries-old existence underwent numerous reconstructions and sometimes were even created step by step. Most of the objects, figuratively speaking, is a bulb of many cultural layers, so it's difficult to speak about their fundamental and absolute authenticity. Any object with all its historical layers is a little bit of a simulacrum. And when, for example, restorers remove later layers of an icon to open its pristine authentic look, they destroy its later authenticity, which also was a "phenomenon" for its time.
In the cultural tourism authentic cultural heritage is increasingly often replaced or duplicated by either the full or by partial simulacra which are not afraid of big tourist flows, which take into account today's technological advances and modern virtual world image. By Jean Baudrillard's trope "simulacra take precedence over history." [24, 124].

These simulacra of the cultural heritage are polyfunctional. On the one hand simulacra - copies of the objects help preserve original cultural heritage, by removing from it the load of tourist flows. On the other hand, they perform educational functions - allow large flows to explore the cultural heritage. And often with less effort and less cost.

Recently, the so-called "miniature parks" have become widely popular. One of the oldest park is the "Ave Maria Grotto"[25] in Alabama (USA), built rom scrap materials by one person -a monk of the monastery of St. Bernard whose name was Joseph Dzoettisom. This park was not originally a part of show business, but rather an eccentric hobby and a holy deed. Built by one person, it is very approximate in terms of authenticity and landscape design and does not create the impression of a show. At present this object is so popular in the U.S that poetry was devoted to it and a ring-ton for a cell phone [26]. Thus, it became an object of trans-media culture.

By contrast, modern mini-parks -there are over 40 of them- are a professional and very expensive work of a large group of architects, designers, cultural heritage experts. They represent the cultural heritage worldwide (Peace Park in Beijing, Mini Siam in Thailand), or across the continent (Europe-Park in Rust, Germany, "Mini Europe" in Brussels, Switzerland) or country (Mini Israel, Spanish Village, "city of Masters" in Barcelona, "Italy in miniature" in Rimini, Madurodom in the Netherlands, "France in miniature" in Elankure, "Portugal in miniature" in Coimbra, etc.) or individual cities (Kiev miniature). They are all thumbnailed architectural sites of world cultural heritage, mainly in the scale 1 / 25 or 1 / 8 like the Beijing one.

But there are precedents for creating a separate cultural simulacrum of the object in full size. “…with the pretext of saving the original, one forbade visitors to enter the Lascaux caves, but an exact replica was constructed five hundred meters from it, so that everyone could see them (one glance through a peephole at the authentic cave and then one visits the reconstituted whole). It is possible that the memory of the original grottoes is itself stamped in the minds of future generations, but from now on there is no longer any difference: the duplication suffices to render both artificial". [27, 167].

Giant hybrid simulacrum is a castle Cloisters, a branch of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, built in the first half of the twentieth century, which includes authentic sculptures and architectural fragments from the five French and Spanish monasteries.

Simulacra begin to be created outside the cultural landscape of the object. In October 2011 Australian open Stonehenge - complete reconstruction of the English original, not in its present, but in its originally intended form. People of the other hemisphere can see the monument in a way much more convenient for them.

In Russia, such mini-parks, are yet to be built in St. Petersburg, Gelendzhik, Chelyabinsk. Such a "gap", it seems to us, is due to the attitude to authenticity in the Soviet Union. Authenticity as a major historical value of a cultural heritage was more important than entertainment. And since all the objects were on the balance of the state, the commercial factor gave way to enlightenment. All national parks, cultural heritage are either open-air museums - Skansen (Vitoslavlitsy, Schelykovsky farm, Suzdal wooden architecture museum), or ethnographic museum complexes, ethnic parks (Kizhi, etc.) are all originals, in the first case brought into one place from different villages, in the second turned into a museum on site and brought back, all of always meet the criteria for authenticity.

However, not always the "simulacrum" is an exact replica of the monument, particularly in the case of ethno-villages giving a show. For example, an ethnic Miao village in China, which actually is a spectacular tourist attraction, more domestic than international. The representatives of the tribe work there as circus performers and shownmen. Unfortunately the authors of the article didn't see there a real recreation of an ethnic village, even as a museum. In this case, the simulacrum of works as social and economic component of the Miao culture, it provides jobs and a sense of significance of the show participants, but it does not contribute to the preservation of culture itself and does not even introduce it to the public.

“… at Cruesot, at the level of the "open" museum where one museumified in Situ, as "historical" witnesses of their period, entire working-class neighborhoods, living metallurgic zones, an entire culture, men, women and children included - gestures, languages, customs fossilized alive as in a snapshot. The museum, instead of being circumscribed as a geometric site, is everywhere now, like a dimension of life. “ [28, 168].
In Orenburg, a tremendous simulacrum was built, called the "National Village", which is a set of national Top 10 town houses of numerous ethnic groups of Orenburg region. Each yard houses an ethnographic museum, a national coffee shop and a library with books in the native language. Farmstead is located on the territory of exhibition, reflecting life and culture of ethnic communities[29].

There are other simulacra, which are created "on the grounds," in the place of genuine monuments of cultural heritage, such as a simulacrum Sarai-Batu, which according to experts doesn't respond to the most basic norms of reconstruction, which nevertheless was turn into a tourist route in the Astrakhan region.

Thus, we can not just talk about the world of simulacra, but about the simulacra of the world's tangible cultural heritage, which is also extremely diverse. We can tentatively try to categorize them according to the degree and nature of the relationship with the original, given the genuine cultural landscape, which helps the perception of the cultural object in its entirety.

Skansen - the original objects in the "alien", close to the culture landscape (eg, open-air museum in Suzdal), historical copies in its cultural landscape (temples in Ise): hybrid simulacra with the inclusion of genuine fragments (Cloisters), ethnographic museum complexes consisting of an original turned into a museum in its own cultural landscape and the real objects specially brought there (Kizhi), restored monuments, that got a form of a "remake" after restoration (Tetyushinov house) complexes of the original and its simulacrum (Lasko) simulacra as the reconstruction in a strange cultural landscape (Australian Stonehenge), mini-parks, pseudo reconstruction (Sarai-Batu), etc. Thus, we see that most of them are still trying to reproduce the original in the extreme close-ups.

However, the future of cultural heritage is likely to belong to simulacra. They better meet the requirements of mass culture and tastes of the "man of the traveling." Of course, it is necessary to take into account that travelers are not a homogeneous mass, but one and the same object of cultural heritage can cause both cognitive and sacred interest. And if to a pilgrim authenticity is extremely important, for it is the basis and the essence of sacredness, for curious tourists, especially for those to whom traveling is something like a nice dessert after a beach holiday, a simulacrum is quite enough. Mass spreading of cultural simulacra, their accessibility, both financial and geographical, as well as the tourist infrastructure around them makes them attractive and popular and therefore commercially viable. Even natural heritage sites, such as, for example, waterfalls Igua-su, due to the inclusion into tourism activities were transformed into a gigantic simulacrum. Authenticity slowly floats away yielding to destiny and leaves the aftertaste of the inevitability of loss.

The Role of Media in Preserving the Authenticity of Cultural Heritage: In recent years media plays a special role in preserving cultural heritage and this role can be both positive and negative. The inclusion in the list of UNESCO World Heritage Site becomes a very significant factor in coordinating of social hierarchy of objects. The very inclusion into UNESCO list is viewed as a kind of guarantee for preserving the monument and at the same time raises the appeal of the object for the tourist business.

However, the inclusion into that list doesn't give lifetime warranty. Failure to comply with the requirements brings to move the object into the UNESCO "black list" of objects under threat. Most often objects included into that list get there not because of the negligent attitude to the object itself, but because the areas around the site and various constructions in the neighborhood do not comply to the norms of security [30].

Koln Cathedral was at the time listed in the "black list" of UNESCO (in years 2004-2006) due to high constructions in the vicinity of the cathedral: there were fracas in London because of the planned construction of a skyscraper "Shard of Glass" and other high buildings in the area of the Tower of London and Westminster Abbey[31]. UNESCO is trying to ban the construction of new metro stations in a crowded Istanbul and the restructuring of some of the poor, but historic neighborhoods of this city [32].

There are disputes in Rome, whether it is possible to construct buildings that exceed the height of the dome of St. Petereven on the outskirts of the city. For this reason, Azerbaijan's the old city of Baku with the Palace of Shirvanshahs and the Maiden Tower was from 2003 to 2009 in the list of sites under threat.

The reserve "Kiev-Pechersk Lavra," and Sophia Cathedral were under threat because of the chaotic dot building in the buffer zones around Laura and Sophia, which hit not only the landscape but also the monuments themselves [33]. According to the director of "Sophia" Nelly Kukovalskaya, the territory of the monument suffers from the rising groundwater, which has already risen up to 3 m, which is detrimental to strip foundations. Besides, there are the cracks in the walls of the ancient buildings, which is also the fault of chaotic
constructions in the vicinity. For the same reason the historical center of St. Petersburg was under threat in 2009 because of the plans to build a commercial "Ohta-Center" [34].

Any man-made interference with the "life" of cultural and natural heritage can be the reason for bringing them into the "black list". The reason for this may be too large a flow of tourists passing through the object and threatening its security. In this case, UNESCO requires to limit the flows, as was done in the old city of Warsaw. The Salt Mine in Wieliczka (Poland) (1989-1998) [35], used to be included into the black list because due to excess of tourism the moisture had risen there, the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador, 2007) [36] - due to excessive tourism and bringing alien species into local zones. Any unauthorized technical work in the area of objects can cause listing the object in the "black list". Because of mining in the vicinity of the park Yellowstone (USA) (1995-2006) [37] was included, because of the salinity of the akes National Park Ishkel (Tunisia) (1996 - 2006) used to be there, because of unauthorized road built the National Park Iguazú (Brazil-Argentina) was listed there in the years 1999-2001.

In this situation the crucial role can be played by the media. The company organized in the press may direct the views of civil society in the right direction, may stimulate peoples efforts to stop the destructive processes. For instance, the problem of the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra was repeatedly publicized in the Russian and Ukrainian press, which enhanced the activity of the public, so the monuments of Ukraina were "saved" from the "black list". At the 34th session of UNESCO in Brazil, it was decided to delete these relics from the list of candidates for the "black list".

A status fate of the monument largely depends on how well the company in the media is organized and whether journalists can find successful arguments to bring the civil society into action.

Thus, one of the most beautiful cities in Europe, Dresden, was excluded from the list of UNESCO because of the construction of bridge Valdshlesshenbryukke over the River Elbe.[38] Despite the company in the press, almost 68% of the citizens of Dresden in a referendum in 2005, voted for the construction of the bridge, so in 2006 UNESCO experts have included the cultural landscape of the Elbe to the list of World Heritage in Danger. Members of the committee warned Germany about the possibility of an unprecedented exception of their object from the list. Company in the press failed and the subject was excluded from the list.

The same fate befell the Reserve of Arabian antelope in Oman in 2007, due to a sharp decline in population of the specie with regard to the active production of oil in the area of reservation [39].

Sad experience has not been lost to Moscow and Kiev. In November 2010, a multimedia video bridge Moscow - Kiev - Saint Petersburg was held on the theme "UNESCO World Heritage Sites. How not to get into the" black list "?" The event was timed to the 65th anniversary of UNESCO. The Russian press media raised an active company to ban the construction of "Ohta-Center" that jeopardized the reputation of Saint Petersburg Governor Valentina Matvienko. At this stage the greatest cultural treasure of Russia was saved.

However, the attack on the cultural heritage did not stop there. At the moment the public is actively fighting for the preservation of the cultural landscape of St. Petersburg. Authorities are trying to prevent the will of the citizens, but the media actively covers the events which ultimately contributes to a more cautious attitude of the city administration to the opinion of the townspeople [40].

As mentioned above, to be included into the List of World Cultural and Natural Heritage is both honorable and difficult and each country strives to fix in this list as many objects as possible, because the very fact inclusion of an object in the list of applicants is very prestigious and it also has a certain commercial component. Therefore the problem of withdrawal from a cultural heritage of its status on an international scale is a kind of "bugaboo" for unscrupulous owners of this facility.

However, at the regional and municipal levels of many countries, in Russia in particular, enlisting of an object with federal, regional and local cultural heritage is not always clearly seen as a blessing. And to solve these problems, as we have said, an important role is played by the media, which raises the public debate around certain events.

For the Russian Federation, the problem of exclusion from the lists of cultural heritage concerns primarily architectural monuments of federal and often regional or local importance: houses and offices that are in poor condition requiring major repair and restoration. The restoration works used to be carried out by the state, but now it does not have the financial ability. These buildings are often situated in the heart of the city, in areas of particular commercial value. Next to them or on their site modern commercial buildings are supposed to be constructed, such as shopping malls, hotels and sports complexes. Therefore, the status of a cultural heritage that
these buildings possess is an impediment to someone's economic interests. So business structures are not interested in the restoration of cultural objects, with serious research and long time required, they would rather see these objects demolished, or at least reconstructed only at the facade level.

In recent years, architectural cultural heritage increasingly disappears from the streets of Russian cities. By the end of 2010 the scale of this phenomenon made citizens turn to the media in order to make this fact public knowledge and to stir up civil society, in order to stop this vandalism or at least to freeze it at the present level. The scandal erupted in connection with the meeting of the State Duma on culture, held November 25 on the adoption of the draft amendments to the Federal Law "On Cultural Heritage of the Russian Federation" (No. 73-FZ of 25.06.2002 d), the so-called Pleskachevsky amendments. They were signed by the chairman of State Duma Committee on Property and it became quite clear that these amendments are lobbied by St. Petersburg city authorities, represented by the vice-governor of St. Petersburg Mr. Metelski. The amendments, ignoring the views of experts in the field of cultural heritage, along with the concept of "restoration" in relation to cultural heritage are trying to institutionalize the concept of "reconstruction." A good conceptual analysis of the difference between these concepts is given in the article of A. Vedenin.[42]

In his time, a Russian painter and art critic I. Grabar proposed to replace the concept of "restoration" to the term "replenishment of losses." In addition to purely technical context, it also has deep philosophical implications. Restoration is really the completion of losses, in terms of lost elements of the object, but also in global terms, the completion of loss of culture, loss of memory. Thus we declare our commitment to authenticity, considering the object as a general cultural historical value, both in Russia and globally. Pursuing a restoration, we emphasize that value of things - its ability to materialize the time, its ancient and genuine nature. Whereas reconstruction is always an action aimed at obtaining probabilistic, subjective, approximate results with a touch of consumerism. Even the attempt to replace the term "restoration" to the term "reconstruction" in official documents marks a new era where the simulacrum becomes the main element of the culture - in a wide range from cultural heritage to electronic cigarettes. After all, the oldest of the cultural heritage - the temple complexes - and tobacco as part of the ritual action in the past were sacred phenomena of culture. Together with its phenomena the world of sacral is also beginning to transform into a world-simulacrum. However, the Russian civil society so far resists to these processes.

At the end of 2010 Russian society community rose in the move to protect the cultural heritage. Experts wrote a letter to the president. This fact was reflected in the media[43]. In the central and regional media, as well as the Internet many mass protest articles emerged, primarily from professional experts in this field. They were joined by non-governmental organizations associated with the cultural heritage[44] and political parties of opposition: thus, the Communist Party, placed on one of its regional portals radio comments about this situation[45]. Mass media attack was reinforced by pickets and rallies in Moscow and the regions. As a result at the beginning of 2011 the amendments were revised and the tension was lifted.

The situation with the demolition of the monument in the city of Kazan can give another proof to the fact that joint actions of media and civil society can prevent the final destruction of cultural objects on the New Year's Eve 2011 two objects of cultural heritage were demolished in Kazan. Numerous reports in local and national media, pickets and demonstrations organized by townsfolk attracted everyone’s attention to this event [46].

Finally this spring, there were official statements that the State Duma refuses to simplify the procedure for exclusion of objects from the list of cultural heritage, [47] thus the joint efforts of public and media at the moment the process of consumerisation of cultural objects is stopped for a while.

CONCLUSION

Modern mass media, originally designed to spotlight events and to communicate to people the necessary information, gradually became not only a political player, but the creator of a new reality and not only virtual reality but the physical one. The objects of cultural heritage also go under the scope of this art as for many years they too have been serving this informative function - kept the memory of the past, the roots of a culture, its nature and its real shape. Accretions of time and social upheavals sometimes tinkered with their images, but it also gave the knowledge of the other layers of time. Until the twentieth century's cultural heritage was seen in the media as leisure or entertaining information, placed in family magazines for home reading. Consumerisation of the cultural heritage, its new place in the formation of civil society and its institutionalization led to that entertainment pages of
newspapers and broadcast channels with information about cultural objects moved in the sphere of the political. And very often, at least in Russia, mass media - even the fact whether it covers or not the events related to cultural heritage- can affect the fate of this cultural objects, as we showed in this article.

Especially critical is the reaction of the media when there is a question of changing the legislative framework, which decides the fate of the monument. It is largely dependent on media, how human kind will treat its cultural objects in the future, whether it will keep authenticity or be replaced by simulations. Although, if the object is already destroyed or there is no ay to save it, let it be a simulacrum instead of yawning emptiness.

But, unfortunately, the media is not omnipotent. And if in St. Petersburg construction project Ohta center was shut down, then the situation in the Dresden unfortunately was not affected by media. Apparently, there must be some kind of unity of interests of the general public and the media. Only in this tandem it is possible to overcome the modern layman consumerism mood and preserve the fragments of the past generations intact.
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