СТОПАНСКА АКАДЕМИЯ

„Димитър А. Ценов" - Свищов

KreativEU
Knowledge & Creativity European University

Международна научно-практическа конференция

90 години дарителство, знание, иновации и устойчиво развитие в СА „Д. А. Ценов" – Свищов

Том III



5-7 ноември 2026 г.

СТОПАНСКА АКАДЕМИЯ „Д. А. ЦЕНОВ“ – СВИЩОВ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНА НАУЧНО-ПРАКТИЧЕСКА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ

90 ГОДИНИ ДАРИТЕЛСТВО, ЗНАНИЕ, ИНОВАЦИИ И УСТОЙЧИВО РАЗВИТИЕ В СА „Д. А. ЦЕНОВ“ – СВИЩОВ

Свищов, 5-7 ноември 2026 г.

Посветена на 90 години от създаването на Стопанска академия „Димитър А. Ценов“

Сборник с доклади

ТОМ III

Международната научно-практическа конференция е организирана при изпълнение на Административен договор № КП-06-МНФ/23 от 18.08.2026 г. (BNSF-1.010-0023-C01) на Фонд „Научни изследвания“ при МОН по Процедура за подкрепа на международни научни форуми, провеждани в Република България

Академично издателство „Ценов“
Свищов
2026

ПРОГРАМЕН КОМИТЕТ
Доц. д-р Марин Маринов
Ректор на Стопанска академия „Димитър А. Ценов“ – председател
Проф. д-р Красимир Шишманов
Проф. д. н. Божидар Божинов
Проф. д-р Любчо Варамезов
Доц. д-р Маргарита Шопова
Доц. д-р Ваня Григорова
Доц. д-р Румен Ерусалимов
Доц. д-р Пламен Йорданов
Доц. д-р Драгомир Илиев
Доц. д-р Иван Марчевски
Доц. д-р Ирена Емилова
Доц. д-р Сергей Найденов
Доц. д-р Катя Личева
Проф. д-р Пенка Шишманова
Доц. д-р Елена Йорданова
Доц. д-р Пламен Петков
Доц. д-р Пепа Стойкова
Доц. д-р Михаил Чиприянов
Доц. д-р Любка Илиева
Доц. д-р Теодора Филипова
Ст. преп. Елка Узунова
Ст. преп. д-р Радослав Николов

ОРГАНИЗАЦИОНЕН КОМИТЕТ
Доц. д-р Здравко Любенов – *председател*
Проф. д-р Светослав Илийчовски
Проф. д-р Атанас Атанасов
Доц. д-р Галина Чиприянова
Доц. д-р Маруся Смокова-Стефанова
Доц. д-р Красимира Славева
Гл. ас. д-р Асен Божиков
Ст. преп. д-р Венцислав Диков

РЕДАКЦИОНЕН СЪВЕТ
Проф. д-р Атанас Атанасов – *председател*
Проф. д-р Светослав Илийчовски
Проф. д-р Красимир Шишманов
Доц. д-р Искра Пантелеева
Доц. д-р Танер Исмаилов
Доц. д-р Здравко Любенов
Доц. д-р Галя Иванова-Кузманова
Доц. д-р Ирена Емилова
Доц. д-р Христо Сирашки
Доц. д-р Елена Йорданова
Доц. д-р Любка Илиева
Доц. д-р Валентин Милинов
Доц. д-р Красимира Славева
Доц. д-р Маруся Смокова-Стефанова
Доц. д-р Венцислав Василев
Доц. д-р Зорница Петкова

Публикуваните материали са рецензирани по метода на двойно сляпо рецензиране. Авторите носят отговорност за съдържанието на материалите, изразените мнения, използваните данни, цитираните източници и езиковото оформление на текстовете. Фонд „Научни изследвания“ не носи отговорност за съдържанието на докладите, представени на научния форум, както и за съдържанието на рекламните и други материали за него.

ISBN 978-954-23-2690-8 (print)
ISBN 978-954-23-2691-5 (online)

D. A. TSENOV ACADEMY OF ECONOMICS – SVISHTOV

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE

90 YEARS OF CHARITY, KNOWLEDGE, INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN D. A. TSENOV ACADEMY OF ECONOMICS - SVISHTOV

Svishtov, 5th - 7th November 2026

Dedicated to the 90th anniversary since the establishment of D. A. Tsenov Academy of Economics

Conference Proceedings

VOLUME III

The International Scientific and Practical Conference was organized in the implementation of Administrative Contract № КП-06-МНФ/23 of August 18, 2026 (BNSF-1.010-0023-C01), awarded by the Bulgarian National Science Fund at the Ministry of Education and Science under the Procedure for Support of International Scientific Forums Held in the Republic of Bulgaria

Tsenov Academic Publishing House
Svishtov
2026

PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Assoc. Prof. Marin Marinov, PhD
Rector of D. A. Tsenov Academy of Economics
Prof. Krasimir Shishmanov, PhD
Prof. Bozhidar Bozhinov, PhD
Prof. Lyubcho Varamezov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Margarita Shopova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Vanya Grigorova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Rumen Jerusalemov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Plamen Yordanov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Dragomir Iliev, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Ivan Marchevski, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Irena Emilova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Sergey Naydenov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Katya Licheva, PhD
Prof. Penka Shishmanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Elena Yordanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Plamen Petkov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Pepa Stoykova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Mihail Chipriyanov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Lyubka Ilieva, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Teodora Filipova, PhD
Senior Lecturer Elka Uzunova
Senior Lecturer Radoslav Nikolov, PhD

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
Assoc. Prof. Zdravko Lyubenov. PhD, Chairman
Prof. Svetoslav Iliychovski, PhD
Prof. Atanas Atanasov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Galina Chipriyanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Marusya Smokova-Stefanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Krasimira Slaveva, PhD
Ch. Assist. Prof. Asen Bozhikov, PhD
Sen. Lect. Ventsislav Dikov

EDITORIAL BOARD
Prof. Atanas Atanasov, PhD – Chair
Prof. Svetoslav Iliychovski, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Iskra Panteleeva, PhD
Prof. Krasimir Shishmanov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Taner Ismailov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Zdravko Lyubenov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Galya Ivanova-Kuzmanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Irena Emilova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Hristo Sirashki, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Elena Yordanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Lyubka Ilieva, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Valentin Milinov, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Krasimira Slaveva, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Marusya Smokova-Stefanova, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Ventsislav Vasilev, PhD
Assoc. Prof. Zornitsa Petkova, PhD

The published materials have been peer-reviewed using the double-blind review method. The authors are solely responsible for the content of the materials, the opinions expressed, the data used, the cited sources, and the linguistic formatting of the texts. The Bulgarian National Science Fund bears no responsibility for the content of the papers presented at the scientific forum, nor for the content of its promotional or other materials.

ISBN 978-954-23-2690-8 (print)
ISBN 978-954-23-2691-5 (online)

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

ТОМ III
ОТРАСЛИ НА ИКОНОМИКАТА

THE FRANCHISE BUSINESS MODEL IN CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS: OPPORTUNITIES AND LEGAL PERSPECTIVES
Prof. Dr. Emilija Gjorgjioska, PhD, Prof. Dr. Tatjana Spaseska, PhD, Prof. Dr. Aneta Risteska-Jankuloska, PhD, Prof. Dr. Dragica Odzaklieska, PhD 9

ЧОВЕШКИЯТ КАПИТАЛ КАТО ФАКТОР ЗА ПРЕДПРИЕМАЧЕСКИЯ УСПЕХ – ЕМПИРИЧНО ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ СРЕД МЛАДИ БЪЛГАРСКИ ПРЕДПРИЕМАЧИ
Проф. д-р Любчо Варамезов, докторант Любомир Николов..... 19

ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕ НА ЕВРОПЕЙСКИТЕ СХЕМИ ЗА КАЧЕСТВО ПРИ СЕЛСКОСТОПАНСКИТЕ ПРОДУКТИ И ХРАНИ В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Проф. д-р Марина Николова..... 27

ПРИЛАГАНЕ НА КЛЪСТЕРЕН АНАЛИЗ ПРИ МОНИТОРИНГ НА ДЕБИТОРСКАТА ЗАДЛЪЖНЯЛОСТ
Проф. д-р Светослав Илийчовски..... 37

ФОЛКЛОРНИЯТ ТУРИЗЪМ КАТО РЕСУРС ЗА РЕГИОНАЛНО РАЗВИТИЕ: СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКИ ПОДХОД
Проф. д-р Теодора Димитрова, д-р Захарина Томова 47

ОЦЕНКА НА ЧУВСТВИТЕЛНОСТТА НА ВЪТРЕШНОТО ПОТРЕБЛЕНИЕ НА ОСНОВНИ ХРАНИТЕЛНИ ПРОДУКТИ В КОНТЕКСТА НА ХРАНИТЕЛНАТА СИГУРНОСТ НА БЪЛГАРИЯ
Доц. д-р Ангел Саров, Гл. ас. д-р Михаела Михайлова, гл. ас. д-р Даниела Цвяткова, гс. д-р Боряна Козарева, ас. Диляна Бояджиева 54

ПРЕКИТЕ ЧУЖДЕСТРАННИ ИНВЕСТИЦИИ НА БАЛКАНИТЕ – ХРОНОЛОГИЯ И ВЪЗМОЖНОСТИ
Доц. д-р Добрин Ганчев, доц. д-р Сергей Найденов 62

ПРЕДИЗВИКАТЕЛСТВА И ОСНОВНИ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА УПРАВЛЕНСКИЯ ПРОЦЕС В СЪВРЕМЕННИТЕ ЗЕМЕДЕЛСКИ СТОПАНСТВА
Доц. д-р Елена Йорданова, гл. ас. д-р Георги Ангелов, гл. ас. д-р Цветан Марков..... 73

ПОДКРЕПА НА ИНИЦИАТИВИ ЗА УСТОЙЧИВОСТ - ВОДЯТ ЛИ ПОЛОЖИТЕЛНИТЕ НАГЛАСИ ДО ГОТОВНОСТ ЗА ПОЕМАНЕ НА РАЗХОДИ?
Доц. д-р Емил Николов 78

ДИГИТАЛНА ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ НА БИЗНЕСА – ПРЕДПРИЕМАЧЕСКИ КОНТЕКСТ
Доц. д-р Искра Пантелеева, проф. д-р Беата Сковрон-Миелник, гл. ас. д-р Себастиан Наройчик..... 88

ДИГИТАЛНАТА ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ И ИЗКУСТВЕНИЯТ ИНТЕЛЕКТ КАТО ДВИГАТЕЛИ НА НОВИТЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В ТУРИЗМА
Доц. д-р Любка Илиева, проф. д.ик.н. Марина Алексеевна Измайлова 97

ИНОВАЦИОННИ ПОДХОДИ В УПРАВЛЕНИЕТО НА ТУРОПЕРАТОРСКАТА ДЕЙНОСТ
Доц. д-р Любомира Тодорова 105

СЕМЕЙНИЯТ БИЗНЕС В БЪЛГАРИЯ КАТО МОДЕЛ ЗА ОСЪЩЕСТВЯВАНЕ НА ТЪРГОВСКА ДЕЙНОСТ
Доц. д-р Петранка Мидова 112

ПРИНОС НА ИКОНОМИКАТА НА СПОДЕЛЯНЕТО ЗА ПОСТИГАНЕ НА ЦЕЛИТЕ ЗА УСТОЙЧИВО РАЗВИТИЕ
Доц. д-р Петя Иванова..... 119

ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕТО НА АНАЛИЗА НА ГОЛЕМИ ДАННИ В ПРЕДПРИЯТИЯТА ОТ РИТЕЙЛ СЕКТОРА: ПРИМЕРИ ОТ ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ СТРАНИ
Доц. д-р Симеонка Петрова..... 127

THE ROLE OF DIGITAL ECOSYSTEMS IN ACCELERATING ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPACITY IN EMERGING ECONOMIES
Assoc. Prof., PhD Tatiana Bucos..... 137

ТУРИЗЪМ В УСЛОВИЯТА НА ГЛОБАЛНА ИКОНОМИЧЕСКА И ГЕОПОЛИТИЧЕСКА КРИЗА
Доц. д-р Тихомир Личев..... 145

СОЦИАЛНАТА ИКОНОМИКА – ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ, ЦЕЛИ, ОБХВАТ
Гл. ас. д-р Ваня Ганева..... 151

ДИСПРОПОРЦИИ В ДИГИТАЛНОТО РАЗВИТИЕ НА ТЪРГОВСКИЯ БИЗНЕС В ЕВРОПЕЙСКИЯ СЪЮЗ
Гл. ас. д-р Зоя Иванова, гл. ас. д-р Иван Маринов..... 158

СЪТРУДНИЧЕСТВОТО И ИНДУСТРИАЛНИТЕ ЕКОСИСТЕМИ КАТО ДВИГАТЕЛИ ЗА ИНОВАЦИИ И РАЗВИТИЕ НА МАЛКИ И СРЕДНИ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЯ
Гл. ас. д-р Ивайло Костов 166

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EURO AND THE FUTURE OF RETAIL TRADE IN BULGARIA: ATTITUDES AND PROSPECTS
Head Assist. Prof. PhD, Ivan Marinov 173

СЪВРЕМЕННИ АГРОБИЗНЕС РЕШЕНИЯ В КОНТЕКСТА НА КРЪГОВАТА ИКОНОМИКА
Гл. ас. д-р Илияна Кръстева..... 181

ДИГИТАЛНО ПРЕПОЗИЦИОНИРАНЕ НА ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИТЕ ДЕСТИНАЦИИ: ИНОВАЦИИ, МАРКЕТИНГ И ИКОНОМИЧЕСКИ ЕФЕКТИ
Гл. ас. д-р Кристина Шопова, д-р Юлия Проценко 188

СИСТЕМА ЗА УПРАВЛЕНИЕ НА ОКОЛНАТА СРЕДА НА ГРИФИД ХОТЕЛИ
Гл. ас. д-р Павлин Павлов 196

ТЪРГОВСКИ КОМУНИКАЦИИ И ИЗПОЛЗВАНЕТО ИМ ОТ СЪВРЕМЕННИ ЗЕМЕДЕЛСКИ ФИРМИ
Гл. ас. д-р Цветелина Кабакчиева 204

ДОВЕРИЕТО В СПОДЕЛЯНЕТО НА ЗНАНИЯ
Гл. ас. д-р Явор Станев 208

ПРЕДПРИЕМАЧЕСТВОТО В КОНТЕКСТА НА НАГЛАСИТЕ В БЪЛГАРСКОТО ОБЩЕСТВО И БИЗНЕС
Ас. д-р Александър Личев 217

ТЕНДЕНЦИИ ПРИ РЕГИСТРАЦИЯТА НА ДРУЖЕСТВА С ПРОМЕНЛИВ КАПИТАЛ В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Ас. д-р Елена Вълчева 225

ТЪРГОВСКИТЕ ФИРМИ В СВИЩОВ В ПЕРИОДА ОТ ОСВОБОЖДЕНИЕТО ДО ВОЙНИТЕ (1912-1918 Г.) – ОБЩ ПРЕГЛЕД
Преп. д-р Емилия Вачева 232

СПЕЦИФИКИ ПРИ „МОДУЛИРАНЕ“ НА ПРАВООТНОШЕНИЯТА В АДМИНИСТРАТИВНОНАКАЗАТЕЛНОТО ПРОИЗВОДСТВО В РЕПУБЛИКА БЪЛГАРИЯ“ /ОБЗОР НА ПОРОЧНАТА САНКЦИОННА ПРАКТИКА
Преп. Игнат Папазов 240

ОБОГАТЯВАНЕТО НА ДЛЪЖНОСТТА – СТРАТЕГИЯ ЗА МОТИВАЦИЯ И ПРЕДПОСТАВКА ЗА ФОРМИРАНЕ НА НЕФОРМАЛНИ ИНОВАЦИОННИ МРЕЖИ
Докторант Анелия Станева 246

РЕТРОСПЕКТИВЕН АНАЛИЗ В РАЗВИТИЕТО НА ПОДХОДА ЛИДЕР КЪМ ВОМР
Докторант Аделина Ангелова 253

ПОТЕНЦИАЛ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ЗА РАЗВИТИЕ НА ГОЛФ ТУРИЗМА В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Докторант Ангел Ангелов 263

ТЕРИТОРИАЛНО РАЗПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ НА ЗАЕТОСТТА И РЕГИОНАЛНИ РАЗЛИЧИЯ В БАЛНЕО, СПА И УЕЛНЕС ТУРИЗМА В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Докторант Антоанета Христова, ас. д-р Бартош Марчинковски 270

ДИСБАЛАНСИ И ПАЗАРНИ ДЕФОРМАЦИИ НА ПОЗЕМЛЕНИТЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Докторант Атанас Атанасов 278

ВЪЗМОЖНОСТИ ЗА УСЪВЪРШЕНСТВАНЕ ПОТЕНЦИАЛА НА ЧОВЕШКИТЕ РЕСУРСИ В СЪВРЕМЕННИТЕ ЗЕМЕДЕЛСКИ СТОПАНСТВА В КОНТЕКСТА НА УСТОЙЧИВОТО РАЗВИТИЕ
Докторант Боримил Шопов 285

КЛИМАТОЛЕЧЕНИЕТО КАТО СПЕЦИАЛИЗИРАНА ФОРМА НА ЗДРАВНИЯ ТУРИЗЪМ: ТЕОРЕТИЧЕН АНАЛИЗ И КОНЦЕПТУАЛНО ПОЗИЦИОНИРАНЕ
Докторант Ваня Стоева-Андонова..... 290

ОТ ЛИНЕЙНИЯ КЪМ КРЪГОВИЯ МОДЕЛ: КОНЦЕПТУАЛНИ ОСНОВИ И СЕКТОРНИ ПРОЯВЛЕНИЯ В ТУРИЗМА
Докторант Виктория Георгиева Джамбазка..... 297

ДИГИТАЛИЗАЦИЯ В ИНДУСТРИАЛНИТЕ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЯ – ОСНОВНИ НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ И ЦЕЛЕВИ ОРИЕНТИРИ
Докторант Деница Гъркова 306

ЗАЩО ESG НЕ РАБОТИ (И КАК ДА ГО НАПРАВИМ ДА РАБОТИ): КРИТИЧЕН АНАЛИЗ НА ESG ПРАКТИКИТЕ В МСП
Докторант Десислава Белева-Димитрова 313

МЕСТНОТО САМОУПРАВЛЕНИЕ КАТО ФАКТОР ЗА УСТОЙЧИВОТО РАЗВИТИЕ И КОНКУРЕНТОСПОСОБНОСТТА НА ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИТЕ ДЕСТИНАЦИИ
Докторант Ива Пламенова Панайотова..... 324

ТЕХНОЛОГИЧНИТЕ ИНОВАЦИИ КАТО ФАКТОР ЗА КОНКУРЕНТОСПОСОБНОСТ
Докторант Калин Борисов..... 332

ФИНАНСИРАНЕ НА ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИ ДЕЙНОСТИ ЧРЕЗ НПВУ И ЕВРОПЕЙСКИТЕ ФОНДОВЕ
Докторант Мария Иванова Павлова-Кондрова..... 340

ЗАПЛАХИ ЗА КОРПОРАТИВНАТА СИГУРНОСТ ПРЕД ТЪРГОВСКИЯ БИЗНЕС
Докторант Ралица Йовчева..... 349

ДИГИТАЛНИТЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ КАТО ФАКТОР ЗА ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ НА ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИТЕ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЯ
Докторант Теодора Попова 357

РАЗВИТИЕ НА ИНДУСТРИЯТА В БЪЛГАРИЯ – РЕТРОСПЕКТИВЕН АНАЛИЗ
Докторант Тихомир Георгиев..... 367

РОЛЯТА НА КЕТЪРИНГ ОБСЛУЖВАНЕТО КАТО ФАКТОР ЗА ПОВИШАВАНЕ АТРАКТИВНОСТТА НА ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИТЕ СЪБИТИЯ
Докторант Цветелина Петрова..... 375

СЪВРЕМЕННИ МЕТОДИЧЕСКИ ПОДХОДИ ПРИ РЕАЛИЗИРАНЕ НА УЧЕНИЧЕСКИ ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИ ПЪТУВАНИЯ
Докторант Цветелина Телбис 382

ИНТЕГРИРАНЕ НА КРЪГОВИ БИЗНЕС МОДЕЛИ В ПРЕДПРИЯТИЯТА КАТО ОСНОВА ЗА ПРЕХОД КЪМ ИНДУСТРИЯ 5.0
Докторант Захари Пенев..... 390

ESG PERFORMANCE AND MARKET VALUATION IN CHINA'S INDUSTRIAL SECTOR: THE MODERATING ROLE OF IDIOSYNCRATIC RISK
PhD student Yan Fu 398

R&D CAPITAL INTENSITY AND FIRM VALUE IN CHINA'S INDUSTRIAL SECTOR: EVIDENCE FROM OWNERSHIP HETEROGENEITY
PhD student Xinyue Du 412

UNMANNEDSTORES–НОВАТА КОНЦЕПЦИЯ В СВЕТОВНАТА ТЪРГОВСКА ПРАКТИКА
Студент Аница Декова 425

ОТРАСЛОВА СТРУКТУРА НА ИКОНОМИКАТА И НЕЙНОТО ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ЗА ИКОНОМИЧЕСКОТО РАЗВИТИЕ
Студент Борислава Горецова 431

ВЛИЯНИЕТО НА ДИГИТАЛИЗАЦИЯТА ВЪРХУ УПРАВЛЕНСКИТЕ РЕШЕНИЯ В МАЛКИЯ БИЗНЕС
Студент Даяна Пламенова Лучева 441

ИКОНОМИЧЕСКИ И СОЦИАЛНИ ИЗМЕРЕНИЯ НА КУЛТУРНОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО

ELENA DALLES AND PHILANTHROPY IN BELLE ÉPOQUE: HERITAGE, SOCIAL IMPACT AND CULTURAL LEGACY
Prof. Dr. Hab. Silviu Miloiu 455

РЕСУРСНИ И ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННИ ПРЕДПОСТАВКИ ЗА ВНЕДРЯВАНЕ НА ИИ-БАЗИРАНИ СИСТЕМИ В БЪЛГАРСКИТЕ ЧИТАЛИЩА
Доц. д-р Александрина Александрова, гл. ас. д-р Атанаска Решеткова, гл. ас. д-р Евгени Овчинников 487

ОТВЪД РЕКА ДУНАВ: НЕВИДИМИЯТ ИКОНОМИЧЕСКИ, ИНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЕН И КУЛТУРЕН МОСТ МЕЖДУ СВИЩОВ И БУКУРЕЩ ПРЕЗ ВЕКОВЕТЕ
Доц. д-р Александър Ганчев 495

КУЛТУРНОТО И ПРИРОДНОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО КАТО ОБЕКТ НА УСТОЙЧИВАТА ОТЧЕТНОСТ
Доц. д-р Галина Чиприянова, студент Emanuel Proenca Gomes, студент Rodrigo Miguel Gomes Rodrigues, студент Lara Alexandra De Paiva Tome, студент Miguel Angelo Bretes Pereira Carolo студент Santiago Pimenta Fernandes, студент Faisal S. A. Abulhatal 502

ПАРАДОКСИТЕ НА ЕДИН ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИ ОБЕКТ: РЕСТОРАНТ И БАР-ВАРИЕТЕ „ЦИГАНСКИ ТАБОР“ МЕЖДУ ЕТНИЧЕСКАТА КУЛТУРА И КОМЕРСИАЛНАТА ЕКЗОТИЗАЦИЯ
Доц. д-р Йелис Еролова, гл. ас. д-р Бехрин Шопова 509

РАЗВИТИЕ НА СТОПАНСКАТА ЕТИКА В БЪЛГАРИЯ
Доц. д-р Катя Личева 517

REMARKABLE, VETERAN AND MONUMENTAL TREES AS HERITAGE: RECOGNITION AND THE GOVERNANCE OF CARE IN SELECTED EUROPEAN JURISDICTIONS
Assoc. Prof. Lucia Nováková, PhD, Prof. Dr. Hab. Silviu Miloiu 522

ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛНИЯТ МОДЕЛ НА СТОПАНСКАТА АКАДЕМИЯ „ДИМИТЪР А. ЦЕНОВ“ ЗА КАЧЕСТВО И УСТОЙЧИВО РАЗВИТИЕ – 90 ГОДИНИ ЛИДЕРСТВО В ИКОНОМИЧЕСКОТО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НА СТРАНАТА
Доц. д-р Росица Колева 540

ПРЕДИЗВИКАТЕЛСТВА ПРЕД ВНЕДРЯВАНЕТО НА ИНОВАЦИИ В КУЛТУРНИЯ ТУРИЗЪМ
Гл. ас. д-р Милен Атанасов, ас. д-р Йоана Константинова..... 550

THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON THE EDUCATION SYSTEM
Senior Instructor PhD in Economic Sciences Fuad Jabbarov Zeydulla Oglu 558

POTENTIAL OF INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS PROTECTING INTRINSIC VALUES IN CULTURAL HERITAGE
Assistant Professor PhD Said Edaich 567

MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS HERITAGE: HISTORICAL, SPIRITUAL, AND INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF FÁTIMA AND CZĘSTOCHOWA
Katarzyna Łukaniszyn-Domaszewska, PhD, Katarzyna Mazur-Włodarczyk, PhD, Elżbieta Karaśq, PhD..... 576

INDUSTRY-ORIENTED CHINESE CRAFTS: AN EXPECTATIONS PERSPECTIVE
Katarzyna Mazur-Włodarczyk, PhD, Katarzyna Łukaniszyn-Domaszewska, PhD 588

WOMEN DONATIONS TO SWEDISH RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS
PhD student Ciocoiu Elena-Adriana 599

РОЛЯТА НА ДИГИТАЛИЗАЦИЯТА ЗА ОПАЗВАНЕТО НА КУЛТУРНОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО
Студент Димитрийка Атанасова Чакова 606

КУЛТУРНОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО КАТО РЕСУРС ЗА МЕСТНОТО ИКОНОМИЧЕСКО РАЗВИТИЕ В МАЛКИТЕ ГРАДОВЕ
Студент Николина Кирякова 615

POTENTIAL OF INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS PROTECTING INTRINSIC VALUES IN CULTURAL HERITAGE

Assistant Professor PhD Said Edaich[1]

Abstract *: While legal protection for tangible cultural heritage appears easy to grasp, the intrinsic values related to its intangible gategory present a challenge for granting such protection. Integrating the intrinsic values and extrinsic ones arises profound questioning. Our study analyzes this central issue regarding the granting of legal protection to cultural heritage on the basis of intrinsic values.*

Keywords: *Cultural heritage, intrinsic values, legal protection*

JEL: Z11, K33

Introduction

It is a well-established principle among nations that protecting cultural heritage is a fundamental task for preserving memory and forging a link between generations. Modern civilizations benefit from their predecessors, finding evidence and arguments that reveal the extent of development achieved by the preceding societies. One need only look to the Sumerian, Akkadian, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations-and others-whose complexities remain beyond the grasp of specialists, who have yet to unlock their deepest secrets.

Cultural heritage remains an authentic register through which the stories of ancestors are passed down to descendants *(ICOMOS 1990)*. It's a source that transfers events development, scientific discoveries and public policies models of previous societies. Due to the collective human awareness about the important role of cultural heritage, the international community has reached a consensus on according to it a special legal protection through coventions and protocols integrated to the domestic laws of states.

Issue Statement

This research attempts to examine the international legal protection afforded to cultural heritage_encompassing both its extrinsic (economic utility) and intrinsic (aesthetic authenticity) values. Indeed, these values remain a subject of significant interest and debate for experts and scholars.

[1] S.Edaich@po.edu.pl, Opole University of Technology

Research Questions

How do international law defines the intrinsic values of cultural heritage, and thereby ensure their protection?

Does the prohibition of illicit trade in artifacts extend to the intrinsic value of these objects?

Methodology

The methodology used in this research relies primarily on analyzing legal texts of international conventions supplemented by relevant rulings and judicial precedent from high courts. A critical approach will be adopted to balance practical implementation of legal provisions with the prevailing regulatory framework.

A. -"Intrinsic Value" in Cultural Heritage

A. 1- Dialytic settling the value system

The system of values constitutes one of the fundamental pillars upon which interpersonal relationships within societies are built. As it encompasses an intricate web of various aspects of individual and collective life, it is difficult for specialists to reach a consensus on a single, fixed definition of values. The role of values in societies remains fundamental and central, as they shape the choices and decisions of both individual and society. The contentious debate about values system arises in the attempt to define the concept of values in three cases (Moore 1922), the first of which stands out through the concepts of "right" and "wrong" that are closely linked to the notion of "duty" or "what ought to be done." A second area of disagreement arises when applying the criteria of "good" and "evil"-concepts that differ from "right" and "wrong" (Tushir 2023) in terms of evaluative tools, objectives, and the source from which they originate. A third, highly contentious case emerges with the use of aesthetic concepts, such as "beautiful" and "ugly," or "good" and "bad". And here, the divide widens due to the conflict between objective and subjective standards. Examining these cases raises a crucial question: Does a thing truly derive its intrinsic value independently of human judgment? In other words, is an object beautiful in itself, or do we require an external opinion to guide us and affirm its intrinsic value? Here, a distinction must be made between "intrinsic value" and "intrinsic properties." Intrinsic values encompass qualities such as beauty, whereas intrinsic properties are rooted in the nature of the object itself. However, intrinsic value and intrinsic properties represent a distinct concepts, as intrinsic value possesses characteristics that intrinsic properties lack(Ibid). If defining the concept of values, in general, is a contentious and controversial matter, what then is the situation when this concept is linked to the cultural heritage?

About this, numerous aspirations and diverse standards clash-not to mention the role of laws and regulations in, first, defining the core values of the

cultural heritage and, second, providing the legal protection necessary to preserve it for the benefit of future generations.

To conclude this debate, it is essential to distinguish between "value" and "valuation" (Edwards 1979).Value is generally understood as the correspondence between the characteristics distinguishing an object and its essence or significance; thus, an object ultimately derives its value from the extent to which it embodies the semantic content inherent in its concept (Hartman 1969). "Valuation", from other side, is a subjective intellectual effort that leads to a judgment regarding the presence or absence of value; it is a process of measuring an object's characteristics based on their semantic content.

A.2- Intrinsic values in cultural heritage : Conceptualization

The concept of the intrinsic value of cultural heritage is reflected in the heritage's inherent significance-a quality that emerges independently of its utility, economic value, or practical applications (Roszczynska 2021). This intrinsic value is gauged through specific criteria such as aesthetics, craftsmanship, antiquity, or rarity.

Intrinsic value is considered a tool for valuating cultural heritage; despite its practical limitations, it is essential for bringing this heritage under legal protection and care. It also serves as a trusted medium connecting individuals with their intellectual output-spanning both past and future generations. This connection is rooted in the positive impact that prompt one to cherish the legacy inherited from earlier civilizations, thereby opening new horizons.

Through a philosophical and legal approach, it is proven that the intrinsic value of cultural heritage constitutes the fundamental basis for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. While tangible heritage derives much of its value from tourism revenue or physical aspect, consequently the 2003 UNESCO Convention regards the value of intangible heritage as intrinsic and independent of its market value. Analyzing the instrinc values of cultural heritage and from a rhetorical approach, given that cultural heritage possesses both intrinsic and market value, we are entitled to ask: does the intrinsic value-which humans attribute to an object as an essential quality-play a role in determining its market value?

Naturally, the answer is well known; suffice it to say that were it not for the public's interest in a cultural heritage item or product, enthusiasts would not be clamoring for it.

Deduction shows that intrinsic value is determinated independently its utility in such way that a given ritual or traditional craft technique is subjected to a protection for itself, rather than what it can generate financially (Pantazatos 2026).

A.3 - International legal protection for the intrisic values related to cultural heritage

One cannot discuss the legal protection of cultural heritage without first briefly outlining the evolution of the concept of such protection within the collective consciousness. But societies had to wait until the 20th century for the first regulatory texts on this subject to emerge. The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict1on 1954 stands as the earliest international instruments to define the basis and scope of legal protection related to cultural property. It is important to note, however, that this Convention-as its title suggests-addressed a specific context linked, from one side, to war as exceptional circumstance, from a second side, the protection icluded only cultural property. If we adopt a legal approach based on terminology, the concept of cultural ownership raises numerous questions regarding the definition of its meaning. which in itself raises a great deal of debate about the concept of cultural property and its correspondence with cultural heritage. This vision has been enshrined in the first chapter, related to general provisions regarding protection, of this convention, the first article defining cultural property states the following : *"For the purposes of the present Convention, the term "cultural property" shall cover, irrespective of origin or ownership:*

(a) movable or immovable property of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people, such as monuments of architecture, art or history, whether religious or secular; archaeological sites; groups of buildings which, as a whole, are of historical or artistic interest; works of art; manuscripts, books and other objects of artistic, historical or archaeological interest; as well as scientific collections and important collections of books or archives or of reproductions of the property defined above;

(b) buildings whose main and effective purpose is to preserve or exhibit the movable cultural property defined in sub-paragraph (a) such as museums, large libraries and depositories of archives, and refuges intended to shelter, in the event of armed conflict, the movable cultural property defined in sub-paragraph (a);

(c) centers containing a large amount of cultural property as defined in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), to be known as "centers containing monuments."

A primary observation regarding the text of this article is its use of the term "Cultural Property" rather than "cultural heritage." Furthermore, it defines this property by enumerating the tangible aspects of the cultural heritage-such as structures, libraries, and institutions-which were on the front lines of bombardment during the war. It is essential to point out, also, that the legal protection relied on the right of ownership (property law) than on the concept of the cultural heritage itself or its intrinsic values (performing arts, craftsmanship, oral traditions). The same course of action was adopted by Clarifying Protocols to the 1954 Convention - First and Second Protocols to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954 and 1999).

Although the Convention is considered a specialized legal instrument, it failed to cover many aspects of cultural heritage, largely because it was enacted

in the aftermath of World War II-a period when cultural assets across the globe had suffered flagrant violations, including destruction, mutilation, theft, and looting.

Article 2 of this convention clarifies the meaning of legal protection, with the text of the article reading as follows: "*For the purposes of the present Convention, the protection of cultural property shall comprise the safeguarding of and respect for such property*" .

And to understand the meaning of safeguarding and respect for such property we recall the third and forth articles. In fact third article states that : "*The High Contracting Parties undertake to prepare in time of peace for the safeguarding of cultural property situated within their own territory against the foreseeable effects of an armed conflict, by taking such measures as they consider appropriate*".

It is evident here that the legal protection afforded to cultural prperty must be preceded by an agreement between the parties; this implies that the concept of legal protection-whether for cultural property or cultural creations-did not emerge from a maturing collective conscience so much as it was necessitated by acts of violence and armed conflict.

Then came the first paragraph of Article 4 of this convention to clarify the meaning of respect for intellectual property by limiting such respect to the following acts: *"The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other High Contracting Parties by refraining from any use of the property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances in use for its protection for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict; and by refraining from any act of hostility, directed against such property"*.

B. - intrinsic values-based on the 1970/1972 UNESCO Conventions.

B.1 - Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970: Confirmation of UNESCO as a supreme instance fighting the illicit trafficking of cultural property

After a long wait, the global collective conscience decided to extend legal protection for cultural heritage from the specific circumstances of war and armed conflict to ordinary living conditions-by which is meant time of peace. The first step in this process was the convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. For the sake of legal precision, it should be noted that, to date, international conventions have not distinguished-in their terminological approach-between cultural property and cultural heritage. It should also be noted that this convention established UNESCO as the preeminent universal organization for combating the illicit trafficking of cultural property; this subsequently

endowed the body with a global role in guiding national policies for the preservation of cultural heritage and aligning them with overarching international policy in this field. Moreover, this convention emerged during a period marked by the onset of the decolonization process experienced by the majority of nations worldwide-a context that drove these countries to seek an international and domestic legal framework to protect their cultural heritage. This treaty also accorded special attention to a preventive approach aimed at safeguarding cultural property, rather than relying on Punishment and prohibition of the illicit trafficking of such valuable property. The most important principles established by this agreement remain as follows:

- Regular establishment of inventories;
- Establishment of export certificates;
- Application of controls and approval of traders;
- Application of criminal or administrative sanctions.
- Organization of information and education campaigns. This convention.

also established the principle of restitution of cultural property to its owners in cases of theft, fraud, or unlawful acquisition, as stated in Article 7, paragraph (b)(ii) which provides that *"States Parties should undertake appropriate measures to seize and return any stolen and imported cultural property Article 7, paragraph (b)(ii) provides that States Parties should undertake appropriate measures to seize and return any stolen and imported cultural property"*. And in article 13 stating that *"parties are responsible at the national level in terms of restitution and cooperation"*.

On the basis of international commitment article 9 of the Convention invits States Parties to use and enhance international cooperation such as the negotiation of bilateral treaties or the control of the export, import and international trade of cultural property.

B.2 - Unesco Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, Paris 1972

Since its adoption as an international legal instrument by 194 states in 1972, the World Heritage Convention has become the most widely ratified UNESCO convention. To this day, it remains the most effective legal tool for protecting cultural and natural heritage, having established a global consensus on the concept of cultural heritage (Lixinski 2008). Since entering into force, the Convention has undergone significant evolution and expansion; the definition of cultural heritage it adopted has shifted toward a more comprehensive concept that harmonizes the tangible and the intangible, while integrating both the intrinsic and market values of cultural heritage assets.

As a result of this convention, the concept of cultural heritage has expanded and its classification has become more complex, while the process of placing it under protection is now subject to rigorous and precise procedures. (Karimov 2026).

In terms of legal terminology, the most significant contribution of this convention is the comprehensive concept of "cultural heritage"; it thereby expands upon the notion of "cultural property" found in the 1954 Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. (Lixinski 2008). This important amendment allowed for the extension of legal protection to numerous categories of cultural heritage aspects including the concept of intrinsic values , as insinuated in the guide lines of the convention in 2005. That change allowed for a cultural link between the subject/object of cultural heritage and the individual or group that produced it (Francioni 2023). In its first article the convention states a definition for the cultural and natural hertitage as following : "For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "cultural heritage":

monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings : groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view".

In the second article it define the new delimitation of natural heritage classified in three categories : natural features, geological and physiographical formations and natural sites. In this article, a new term linked to Outstanding Universal Value was introduced upon which the World Heritage Committee based its definition of the criterion of representativeness. It is the criterion that allowed for the introduction of the element of diversity and the integration of all the world's cultures (Francioni 2023). The innovative intitutions introduced by this convention-which we previously outlined-remain among the key elements for understanding the intrinsic value of cultural heritage in general. This does not, however, preclude us from noting the numerous legal elements aimed at creating an effective and dynamic framework that serves the interests of cultural heritage on a global scale.

B. 3 - The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003: Instilling the intrinsic values of cultural heritage

A preliminary reading of the text of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage reveals that the scope of protection has been expanded to encompass living traditions, languages, and practices (Dyschkant 2015). Despite this profound evolution, the contemporary legal approach to artifacts acquisitions remains grounded in the concept of ownership; the object is regarded as property that can, consequently, be disposed of (Frigerio 2025). Applying internationally recognized principles of ownership, cultural heritage-in

both its tangible and intangible forms-is considered public or communal property; however, its value is not limited to the economic realm but extends to social significance, encompassing identity, memory, and a sense of belonging (Gkana, 2019). This convention was adopted on 2003 and etred into force on 2006, and beyond the protection of intangible cultural heritage, one of the key outcomes of this convention is the raising of local and global awareness through the promotion of cooperation and assistance among states and competent bodies. However, the definition of intangible cultural heritage set forth in article 2 represents a significant shift in the legal approach to this institution; this article stipulates the following: ″For the purposes of this Convention,

1. The "intangible cultural heritage" means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.

2. The "intangible cultural heritage", as defined in paragraph 1 above, is manifested inter alia in the following domains:

(a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;
(b) performing arts;
(c) social practices, rituals and festive events;
(d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
(e) traditional craftsmanship.

3. "Safeguarding" means measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage.

4. "States Parties" means States which are bound by this Convention and among which this Convention is in force.

5. This Convention applies mutatis mutandis to the territories referred to in Article 33 which become Parties to this Convention in accordance with the conditions set out in that Article. To that extent the expression "States Parties" also refers to such territories″.

Conclusion

The legal protection of cultural heritage-encompassing both its tangible and intangible aspects-while accounting for the specific nature of "intrinsic values" gives rise to a profound intellectual debate reflected in the ongoing discourse among researchers. Yet, it remains difficult for legal drafting to fully resolve the ambiguities and questions surrounding the definitions of these specific attributes; the economic dimension often overshadows the intrinsic value-which tends to be relegated to mere showcases and intellectual debates during special occasions. Furthermore, illicit trade and the misappropriation of customs and traditions pose a new persistent threat to the cultural heritage of nations unable to safeguard it. This point of view is affirmed by the main rulings issued by competent courts-most notably, the European Court of Human Rights like the case of J. Paul Getty Trust and others v. Italy, Application no. 35271/19.

References

- Aliki Gkana, Peoples' heritage or States' heritage? Sovereignty in the UNESCO mechanism for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, European Society of International Law, 2019 ESIL, Annual Conference, Paper No. 19/2019.
- Alberto Frigerio, Legal personhood for cultural heritage? Some preliminary reflections, International Journal of Cultural Property (2025), 32: 347–354.
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage on 2003.
- Convention for the protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed - Conflict with regulations for the Execution of the Convention, Hague 1954.
- Dyschkant, Alexis. 2015. "Legal Personhood: HowWe Are Getting It Wrong." University of Illinois Law Review 4: 1703–35.
- Edwards, R.B. Intrinsic and extrinsic value and valuation. *J Value Inquiry* **13**, 133–143 (1979).
- Erich Hatala Matthes, The Routledge Handbook of Heritage EthicsEdited By Andreas Pantazatos, Tracy Ireland, John Schofield, Rouran Zhang, 2026.
- F. Francioni and F. Lenzerini, The 1972 World Heritage Convention, p. 27. Ed II, 2023.
- G. E. Moore's text "The Conception of Intrinsic Value", 1922, as chapter VIII (pp .253-75) of the selection from his philosophical papers which Moore published as his Philosophical Studies (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. , London) 1922.
- Karimov E , Nazli Ahmadova N, Abbasova K, Inji Moylamli I, Aliyeva M, Giving value to heritage: The use of intrinsic and contextual heritage attribution criteria in international and comparative law, International Journal of Cultural Property (2026), 33, e25, 1–24.
- Lucas Lixinski , The 1972 World Hheritage Convention: A Commentary by F. Francioni and F. Lenzerini, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Magdalena Roszczynska-Kurasinska, Intrinsic Value and Perceived Essentialism of Culture Heritage Sites as Tools for Planning Interventions, Sustainability *2021,* 13(9).
- Robert S. Hartman, The structure of value, Carbondale, Southren Illinois University Press, 1969, p154.
- Sangeeta Tushir, The Concept and Debates in Intrinsic Value, Internatyional jiournal for research publication & seminar ISSN: 2278-6848 | Volume: 14 Issue: 04 | July - September 2023.