
Recognition of Principles of Social Economy in the Activities of Community Initiatives in Latvia

Sociālās ekonomikas principu atpazīstamība kopienu iniciatīvu aktivitātēs Latvijā

Valters Dolacis, Mag. theol. (Latvia)

Ingrīda Jespere, Mag. sc. ing. (Latvia)

The article advocates the principles of Social Economy (SE) as possibility to develop innovative social technologies for the social cohesion of society in situation of economic breakdown. The concept of Social Economy can be considered as European tradition and challenge for applying and finding sustainable forms of social inclusion on national level. The purpose and the object of the study is to investigate, which spheres and principles of SE are evident in the activities of community initiatives in Latvia thus establishing the recognition level of conceptual understanding and practice of Social Economy in national context among the Third Sector activities in Latvia and specifically non-profit movements. The overview of selected community initiatives showed there are initiatives that could be (1) placed in the sphere of productive economy on the scale of a community (2) by the very marginal people involved in initiatives, (3) administered as small businesses, (4) controlled by the people involved with democratic means of decision-making and (5) supported by social services and social workers, in order to overcome social exclusion.

Closing part shows Social entrepreneurship as one of the social technologies, forms of Caritative social work for social cohesion of disadvantaged and marginalized groups of society and anthropological perspective on activating people's inner resources and human potential in the activities of social enterprises.

Keywords: Social Economy principles, social inclusion, co-operatives, mutual societies, associations, community initiatives, productivity, Social entrepreneurship, Caritative social work, image and likeness of God in a person, human potential, inner resources, reciprocity.

Introduction

Topicality of the paper is explained by the need for finding possibilities for social cohesion of marginalized people in situation of economic breakdown which results in the lack of accustomed resources of financial aids to the people in need. As the operational sphere of social work is directly connected with providing assistance for the people in need, there appears necessity for finding innovative forms of providing assistance in such a situation. Therefore author of the paper advocates the principles of Social Economy (SE) as possibility to develop innovative social technologies for the social cohesion of society in situation of economic breakdown. The concept of Social Economy can be considered as European tradition and challenge for applying and finding sustainable forms of social inclusion on national level. Thus the purpose and the object of the study is to investigate, which spheres and principles of SE are evident in the activities of community initiatives in Latvia that help to overcome the situation of social exclusion of the people.

Attribution of principles of Social Economy has a potential of providing for the practice of social work in Latvia its European dimension and innovative practice of renewal of human potential of socially marginalized people both in urban and especially rural settings. Of great importance in situation of lacking the resources become different forms of informal and non-monetary assistance, especially strengthening the social capital of people's associations helping to overcome social depression. As the Social Economy has demonstrated that it can greatly improve the social status of disadvantaged people, the further study would focus on unfolding the concept of SE.

The concept and practice of Social Economy

The system of values and the principles of conduct of the popular associations, synthesized by the historical co-operative movement, are those which have served to formulate the modern concept of the Social Economy, which is structured around *co-operatives*, *mutual societies*, *associations* and recently *foundations*, although charity (charity foundations, brotherhoods and hospitals) and mutual assistance organisations had seen considerable growth already throughout the Middle Ages. During last decades growth in SE has taken place in the field of organisations producing 'social or merit goods', mainly work & social integration, providing social services and community care.

These types of organizations are known for their capacity to respond to emerging needs and new social demands, particularly in periods of crisis marked by socioeconomic transformations, especially in the areas where the market of the public sectors seem to fail (Bouchard, 2010a, 11). SE organizations offer support services to economic development: local development, community de-velopment, solidary financing, creation and maintenance of jobs, job insertions, etc. (Bouchard, 2010b, 117). They are created to meet their members' needs through applying the principle of self-help; they are companies in which members and users of the activity in question are usually one and the same.

Speaking on wider scale, SE plays an essential role in the European economy by 1) combin-ing profitability with solidarity, 2) creating high-quality jobs, 3) strengthening social, economic and regional cohesion, 4) generating social capital, 5) promoting active citizenship, solidarity and a type of economy with democratic values, which puts people first, 6) in addition to supporting sustainable development and social, environmental and technological innovation (The Social Economy in the European Union:

Summary of the Report, 2007, 5-6). SE has developed from particular organizational and legal business formations (cooperatives, mutual societies, associations, social enterprises, foundations a.o. entities) in each European country.

Statistics do show that in the EU-25, over 240,000 co-operatives were economically active in 2005. They are prominent in agriculture, financial intermediation, retailing and housing and as workers' co-operatives in the industrial, building and service sectors. These co-operatives provide direct employment to 4,7 million people and have 143 million members (Cooperatives Europe Performance report 2006). Important source of information concerning SE legislative and operational practice in Europe is report drawn up for the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) by CIRIEC: *The Social Economy in the European Union* (2007).

Social Economy values, functions and principles

SE **values** are highly consistent with the common EU objectives of social inclusion and whereas decent employment, training and re-inclusion should be linked. This links SE with the operative sphere of social policy at national level. The SE has demonstrated that it can greatly improve the social status of disadvantaged people (as in case of microcredit or savings-and-loans cooperatives, facilitating financial inclusion, increasing women's influence) and that it has a substantial capacity for social innovation, encouraging those facing difficulty to find solutions to their own social problems, as regards reconciling their professional and private life, gender equality, the quality of their family life, and their ability to care for children, elderly people and people with disabilities (The Social Economy in the European Union: Summary of the Report, 2007, 5).

SE has been recognized on the level of the European Parliament as the *cornerstone of the European social model* (Report on a European Social Model for future, 2006). The level of national acceptance relates to the level of recognition: 1) of the concept (and its term), the Social Economy; 2) to the recognition of similar concepts 'Social Enterprises', 'Non-profit sector' and 'Third sector'; and finally 3) to the recognition of other concepts. Legislative and conceptual studies have shown that Latvia is a country with a *medium (relative) level* of acceptance of the concept of the SE (by public authorities, SE enterprises, and academic world). However, Estonia and Lithuania are considered as countries with *little recognition* of the concept of SE (*see The Social Economy in the European Union, 2007, 35-38*).

In the scientific field there coexist several definitions of SE: 1) social economy; 2) solidarity-based economy (mainly in French and Spanish speaking countries 3) social enterprises; 4) co-operatives; 5) non-profit or third sector – the latter two being the basic fields of discourse for SE in Latvia; the related terms *non-profit sector, voluntary sector* and *non-governmental organisations* enjoy a greater level of relative recognition in Latvia as well. Additionally to that some authors speak of main four analytical paradigms characterizing the specific features of SE organizations: 1) Market failure and government failures; 2) Social economy; 3) Solidary economy; 4) Civil society (Enjolras, 2010, 44-48) that gives the helpful discursive context for finding the characteristics of SE organizations on national level.

There exist three main **social functions** characteristic to SE organizations: **1) solidary function** – where economy evolves from being a tool of solidarity to being the aim of the organization in order to provide assistance in solving life-relevant

issues of the people; **2) democratic function** – where participation potentialities allow organizations to be ‘schools of democracy’ by which its members are able to develop political skills and civic, communitarian virtues; and **3) productive function** – that differs from that of governmental and for-profit organizations (price of products is inferior to the market price or a lack of competition on the market, although being relevant market players) (Enjolras, 2010, 48-52).

Being the approach based on European social model, Latvian Christian Academy has developed a **profession of Caritative social work** operating with the differing social work and other methodology, i.e., realizing innovative caritative technologies with a goal to stabilize the cohesion of society and the social and spiritual functioning of social objects (see Gūtmane, 2009). Caritative social worker professionally includes his own activity in this EU set system of social protection that works against exclusion of a person. Therefore when developing the principles for Caritative social work activity on the basis of those of SE, it is possible to speak about **social entrepreneurship**, which is EU promoted concept not driven mainly by the profit motive but by social benefit to those being involved in this activity (see Social Business Initiative, 2011), in that way multiplying the forms of social capital for overcoming so called ‘social depression’ at urban and rural level (see Report on Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation in combating unemployment, 2014).

Concluding, **the principles of SE** in modern identification by SE organizations are:

- 1) the primacy of the individual and the social objective over capital;
- 2) voluntary and open membership;
- 3) democratic control and decision-making by the membership;
- 4) the combination of the interests of members/users and/or the general interest;
- 5) the defense and application of the principle of *solidarity, responsibility, reciprocity (social capital) and empowerment*;
- 6) autonomous management and independence from public authorities;
- 7) most of the surpluses are used in pursuit of sustainable development objectives, services of interest to members or the general interest (see The Charter of Principles of the SE, 2000).

These principles would serve as a basic guidelines for finding the appropriate activities of community initiatives in Latvia later in the study.

The practices of Social Economy in Baltic region

Speaking of **SE in numbers**, the situation shows that SE in Latvia is relatively small not only in Latvia but also in Baltic countries. As for situation on 2004-2005 in Latvia, co-operatives and other similar accepted forms provided paid employment for 300 jobs, including 15 000 mem-bers and 34 enterprises (see: *Cooperatives Europe* Performance report 2006). Speaking of *Agricultural co-operatives* in the same period, it provided paid employment for 510 jobs, including 8 390 members and 72 enterprises (see Report of the Social Economy in the European Union, 2007, 44; COGECA, General Confederation of Agricultural Co-operatives in the European Union); the number of mutual societies and associations, foundations and other similar accepted forms are not indicated.

To have a comparison among the Baltic countries, paid employment (jobs) in co-operatives, mutual societies and associations, as for 2004-2005, was as following: 1) in **Estonia**: in co-operatives – 15 250, in associations – 8 000, in mutuals – not indicated;

= totally 23 250 jobs; 2) in **Lithuania**: in co-operatives – 7 700, in associations & mutuals – not indicated; = totally 7 700 jobs; and 3) in **Latvia**: in co-operatives – 300, in associations in mutuals – not indicated; = totally 300 jobs (*see* The Report of the Social Economy in the European Union, 2007).

Social Economy entities among community initiatives in Latvia

The Social Economy does not just see people in need as the passive beneficiaries of social philanthropy, but it also raises citizens to the status of active protagonists of their own destiny thus putting strong emphasis on community work in practical action possibilities at local level. Therefore the interest of further study in the context of social work possibilities can be narrowed to the following parameters: **1)** finding following community practices that create useful and productive work *by* and *for* marginal people; **2)** finding the social work practices that provide for possibilities of renewal of human potential of socially marginalized people in urban and rural settings and stimulating social inclusion of these people.

As the source for analyzing the community initiatives at national level has served the data basis of Zemgale NGO Support Centre and North-Kurland NGO Support centre, as well as information from Rural development centre in Daugavpils and other sources. In the first part of the Table 1 there are listed *SE entities* and corresponding *principles* concluded earlier in this study and made more explicit for recognition purposes in the *community initiatives* listed in the second part of the Table. Initiatives were selected from NGO activities from West and East regions of Latvia.

In that way based on study, which spheres and principles of SE are evident in the activities of community initiatives in Latvia and Baltic countries by studying Third Sector and looking for non-profit SE activities, the following initiatives and their constitutive principles were found as following (*see* Table 1 & 2):

Table 1

SE entities, their characteristics, and corresponding SE enterprises

(=> *see* continuation of Table 1 on the next page)

SE entities	Characterizing principles		=>
1) <i>Co-operatives</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • voluntary and open belonging to organization • equal voting rights • decisions are made by majority of votes • include members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes investment in capital which is floating • autonomy and independence • of special importance are spheres of agriculture, producing, banking, retail business and services 	=>
2) <i>Mutuals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • voluntary and open belonging to organization • equal voting rights • decisions are made by majority of votes • membership fees are based on insurance calculations (where that is of importance) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no capital investments • autonomy and independence • medical, life and non- life, banking sector, social risks insurance, guarantee systems, housing mortgage 	=>

SE entities	Characterizing principles		=>
3) <i>Associations/volunteer organizations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • voluntary and open belonging to organization • equal voting rights • decisions are made by majority of votes • membership fees • no capital investments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • autonomy and independence • services providers, volunteer work, sports and advocacy/representation • crucial services providers in health care, care of elderly and children and social services 	=>
4) <i>Foundations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ruled by trustees • capital is received via donations and grants • research financing and launching, supporting international, national and local projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allocation of subsidies in order to alleviate need of particular people • financing of volunteer work, health care and that of elderly people 	=>
5) <i>Social enterprises and other entities</i> <i>a. local action and initiative groups</i> <i>b. charitable and/or ecclesiastic entities</i> <i>c. environmental associations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'non-profit institutions serving households': charities, relief and aid organisations, trades unions, professional or learned societies, consumers' associations, political parties, churches or religious societies and social, cultural, recreational and sports clubs • organizations of social utility [<i>sociālā labuma organizācijas</i>]: covering the third sector activities for public goodness, ranging from churches to culture, sports and leisure time associations: <i>a) the primacy of the project over activity</i> <i>b) the non-profit character and the altruistic management</i> <i>c) the social contribution of associations</i> <i>d) the democratic management</i> <i>e) existence of an official approval</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no universally accepted definition • there are social and societal goals merged with spirit of entrepreneurship of private sector • profit is invested anew in order to achieve wider social or societal goals • advocating the needs of socially marginalized people or people close to the social risk group • are registered as private enterprises, cooperatives, associations, volunteer organizations, charity or philanthropy organizations or mutuals; some are not registered as legal bodies 	=>

[Sources: The Charter of Principles of the Social Economy, 2000; The Social Economy in the European Union, 2007; Social Economy and MSE enterprises in EU; Conference of European Churches, 2005; Borzaga et. al., 2001; Richez-Battesti et al., 2010, 96].

Table 1 continued

=>	SE enterprises	Specification	National level (selected initiatives from West and East regions of Latvia)
=>	1) <i>co-operatives</i>	Savings-and-loans cooperatives Agricultural co-operatives Microcredit co-operatives	Cooperative credit (savings-and-loans) union in Šķilbēni rural district (Daugavpils region) (20 members) Agricultural cooperative in Līksna rural district (Daugavpils region) (10 members of agricultural farms)
=>	2) <i>mutuals</i>	Mutual insurance companies	
=>	3) <i>associations/ volunteer organizations</i>	Flat owners' associations Agricultural coops	Latvian Association of Flat Owners' Cooperatives (35 coops members)
=>	4) <i>community foundations</i>	Community philanthropy foundations Support foundations Resource centers	Community foundations in Lielvārde, Talsi, Madona, Valmiera, Alūksne Latvian Cultural Endowment Local community initiatives and resources centre (Rugāji region) Women for Europe (entrepreneurship centre for women in Roja city) Rural entrepreneurs for integration of blind in labor market (Liepāja c.)
=>	5) <i>social enterprises and other entities:</i>	Social enterprises 'Non-profit institutions serving households' Organizations of social utility	Employment farm for social risk groups in Skrudaliena (Daugavpils region) Academy of Philanthropy/ Co-operative <i>Sāta</i> (producing and providing assistance in kind to social risk groups, Balvi region) Knitting workshops for disabled people (Ludza Society for Disabled) Social enterprise of handicraft products <i>Andelplacis</i> (Rēzekne region)
=>	a) <i>local action and initiative groups</i>	Societies for people with special needs Carers communities Rural partnerships Local Initiative Groups	Latvian Society for the Blind (12 branches); Liepāja Society for the Blind Latvian Umbrella Body for Disability organizations SUSTENTO Latvian Society for the Disabled Social carers community in Kalupe rural district (Daugavpils reg.) Rehabilitation & work facilities for disabled in Medneva (Balvi region) Orphan care centre Together with us (volunteer organization in Rugāji) Local societies of senior citizens

=>	SE enterprises	Specification	National level (selected initiatives from West and East regions of Latvia)
=>	<i>b) charitable and/or ecclesiastic entities</i>	Diaconal centers (Church) Religious societies	Deaconal centre of the Latvian Lutheran Church (13 branches in LV) Caritas Latvija (Catholic deaconal organization) Charity foundation Agape (assistance to jobless people, philanthropy)
=>	<i>c) environmental associations</i>	Environmental protection	Self-provisionary climate risks reducing ecological farming in South Latgale (Cultural studio <i>Speiga</i>)

[Source: see 'Sources of community initiatives' in Bibliography]

Table 2

The Baltic perspective (SE entities)

Estonian SE entities	Lithuanian SE entities
Community foundation in Peipsi, Viljandi, Järva; Tartu Cultural Endowment	Visaginas, Alytus, Utena, Samogitian, North Lithuanian, Papile Neighborhood and "J. L. Vynerio" Charity Community foundations
Estonian Union of Co-operative Housing Associations (over 100,000 people living in co-operative housing) www.ekyl.ee	Association of Lithuanian Credit Co-operatives (for financial inclusion), www.lku.lt; Union of Lithuanian Cooperatives

[Source: Community foundations in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania]

European Cooperative Society – possibility for Latvia

Characterizing the situation in 2010, the national experts of the Study on the implementation of the Statute for *European Cooperative Society* (SCE) have provided further evaluation of the co-operative movement, describing their fields of competence (e.g., the biggest agricultural cooperatives, flat owners' cooperatives and credit cooperative societies):

1) Latvian agricultural cooperatives Association (55 coops members) established 2002; 2) Latvian Association of Flat Owners' Cooperatives (35 coops members) established 1998; 3) Legislators have taken all necessary measures to implement Regulation 1435/2003 (there is a *Law of European Cooperative Society* accepted; effective from 23.11.2006); 4) In the State Register of Enterprises there have been no single SCE registered; 5) In Latvia, there are no reward incentives to create SCE (see Study on the implementation of the Regulation 1435/2003 on the Statute for European Cooperative Society, 2010, 705-706).

Form of *European Cooperative Society* has not yet received a distribution in Latvia for the following reasons: 1) Cooperative as a form of business organization in Latvia is not popular; 2) The cooperative sector is underdeveloped and weak, there are no cooperatives producing any products; and 3) in Latvia, the presence of cooperatives

are markedly in the following sectors: **a)** Management of apartment ownership (Latvia is an analogue of condominiums in Europe) – to 1000 cooperatives (Association of Flat Owners' Cooperatives – 35 coops members); **b)** Credit Society – 36 cooperatives; **c)** Agricultural service cooperatives – 63 (agricultural service cooperatives association members – 55); **d)** There are cooperatives in other industries, but their numbers are insignificant and economically they are not strongly developed.

Case study

National example. The already mentioned *associations of flat owners* in Table 1 (or *housing cooperatives*; in Latvian 'dzīvokļu īpašnieku biedrība') have increased in their number and scope of their operational activity. For example, in the city of Jūrmala alone (ca. 20 000 inhabitants) with 1 000 apartment houses in 2010 there were only 6 flat owners associations that have assumed their rights of managing the house on their own. In one year, by 2011, their number has increased to total of 37 societies and this number is continuously growing. When analyzing their belonging to the sphere of SE, the constitutive indicators of these cooperatives match the SE entity:

- origins – established in order to manage (to provide the service of managing) a house for the needs of the community of a house;
- membership – members of society: the inhabitants of a house, following the equality principle of democracy (1 person – 1 vote);
- finances – are not distributed among members but channelled for provision of service of house-managing and improving the quality of living;
- activity – directed towards people's welfare and decent house managing, possible only via mutual managing;
- in case of dissolution, financial assets are turned into material assets for the sake of a house.

International example. Also *savings-and-loans cooperatives* recently in the world have developed diverse forms of activity, for example, providing the loans to the borrowers in poor or remote areas that are connected with the *involvement of individual relationships* (in terms of personal accountability in front of community members who are guarantors of loan, as in case of Bangladesh), and *reciprocal solidarity* (social capital value) thus securing the determination of a person in achieving his goals, keeping this determination alive. Such a loan system¹ develops a culture of thrift, hard work, savings and mutual aid. Local community-based voluntary mutual aid societies provide bottom-up delivery of health care and financial services and promotes a culture of thrift and work, especially when working among the poor. Trust-based loan bottom-up model builds human, family, and social capital by helping the poor to help each other in a voluntary and businesslike fashion that builds respect and self-esteem. Thus the poor 1) can take care and responsibility of themselves, 2) they can support each other, 3) and make an important contributions to society. All people, including the poor, have enormous capacity to help themselves as inside every human being there exists a precious treasure of initiative and creativity waiting to be discovered, unleashed, changing life for better (*see Yunus, 2008*). Possibilities of implementation of such practices in national context ask for a separate study.

Social entrepreneurship as the form of social work and its anthropological framework

The objectives of social entrepreneurship are social objectives, not primarily for profit making. The term *social* here includes the meaning and practice of relationships, consequently the community of people, within which the separate, individual person gains a competence for solving of problems of one's own life. Consequently, social entrepreneurship is directed towards the stabilization of human life by bringing him or her in community with other people for solving common problems. In that way, social entrepreneurship acquires anthropological-oriented character, in which of importance becomes not only the aspects of making relationships for obtaining and consolidating the competence, but also the inner stabilizing factors of a person that allows a person to stay and endure in these relationships.

The objective in social work is to help persons, families, groups of persons and society in general to facilitate or to renew their ability to function *socially*, as well as to create favourable environment for this functioning, as it is stated in the Law of social services and social assistance of Republic of Latvia (*see* Sociālo pakalpojumu un sociālās palīdzības likums, § 1.19). The definition of Caritative social work deepens this definition of social work, because Caritative social work, being analogue to that of social work in Latvia, includes the renewal of abilities of individuals, families and groups not only to function socially but as well to function *spiritually*, as stated in the Law (*Ibid.*, § 1.32). Such a setting is essential because without recovery of spiritual functioning, it is not possible to ensure stable renewal of social functioning.

Thus the approach of Caritative social work and social entrepreneurship deepens operational definition of social work, as social functioning in its essence covers person's life holistically, in its entirety – person's inner processes and forming external social relationships. Therefore **social entrepreneurship becomes a form of social work**, as it solves the renewal of social functioning of a person. It is done by organizing individuals for such entrepreneurial activities, which are directed towards achieving social objectives. Here dominate not the profit making as a primary objective, with what social entrepreneurship differs from classic entrepreneurship. Here dominates the objectives of stabilizing a person's life, and these objectives are reached with the means of reciprocity.

Nowadays it is possible to notice in the helping professions the crisis of profession, when person is disappearing from the centre of the helping profession, namely, in institutional systems of assistance client is no more in the centre. Place of the centre is taken by the institutional system itself, by its resources and methods as a goal in itself. The reason of it is the bureaucratising of the system of assistance, in which of importance becomes the registering of effectivity of the assistance provided as the demand from leadership regarding case work of social workers. Because of the limited time, which is being devoted for solving an individual case, this demanded effectivity is not reached fully. Secondly, crisis of profession in social work is deepened by phenomena when a person is turned into a blunt receiver of assistance (consumer) who is no more willing to realize his or her human potential. System is not putting in action mechanisms that would help a person to unlock one's own inner potential for overcoming spiritual and social isolation, as it asks for working with the processes of a "client's" inner world. However, for that social workers are not trained. In Caritative social work, this sphere of work, in its turn, is brought forward as the primary one.

Social entrepreneurship as the form of social work is exactly one of the ways to return a “social client” in the position of socially active life, by providing him or her the lacking, forgotten or undeveloped skills of self-determination in solving problems.

Renewing a human identity in this context means returning a human potential. In its turn, at the foundation of human identity, using theological terminology, there lies *God's image and likeness (Imago Dei)* that is placed in every person. *Image of God* is that given constant predisposition in a human that determines his or her likeness to the very Person of Triune God, and marks out a human being from all other God's created beings on this earth as inseparable unity of spirit, soul and body. As defined by Holy hierarch Theophan the Recluse, from the *image of God* there stems out human qualities that define a person: 1) the fact a person is endowed with a *reason*, intellect, his or her “ego” consciousness, ability to distinct oneself from other beings, from what results 2) human *independence*, sovereign or self-reliant capacity to act in the limits of reasonable freedom that, in its turn, is connected to ability for *taking responsibility*, and 3) *vitality*, as a human being in the moment of his or her origins is not yet the one whose potential he or she can become, so a person develops, forms oneself, becomes (Феофан Затворник, святитель, 2008, 198-199). These are thoughts, feelings and wishes of a person itself, which are turned inwardly, settle down in the spiritual nature of a person and transform into nutrition or elements of growth for the entire person. The most essential quality of human life and personality is *immortality* that includes limitless potential of possibilities of perfection of a human being.

Towards this renewal and increase of potential of becoming a human person there should be directed the professional activity of all helping professions, including that of Social entrepreneurship as well. Potential of human-becoming in a person, in its turn, is defined by *likeness of God*, which is the changing value (as opposed to the *image of God*) and should be developed as the growth of *humanity* in a human, in other words, as possibility for a personal growth. But this process takes place gradually as the renewal of God-likeness or *humanity* in a person is the process that takes time, and every step in this process is built on the achievement of the previous one, – steps being the levels of spiritual maturation of a person. As St. Isaac the Syrian has said: “В меру жития бывает восприятие истины” – “To the measure of one's living is the perception of truth” (Журавский, 1995, 12-13), namely, to the measure of inner purification there unfolds possibility of accepting the reality; in other words, to what extent a person has developed spiritually, to that extent he or she is capable of perceiving the truth, the reality around. Practically it means, we cannot ask of a person (or demand changes from a client) what he or she is not ready for inwardly.

There are several ways that the *likeness of God* can be renewed in a person: through conscience, through reciprocity or community with others, and work.

Conscience is the core of virtues in a person whose centre is the *image of God*, ever-present reminder (of inner nature) about the protonorms of the divine order interweaved in this world. Holy hierarch Theophan the Recluse has spoken of conscience as the power of spirit in a person, which, recognizing the law and freedom, defines their mutual relationships in a person, and finally when conscience merge with the will of a person, there cease to exist inner revolt: a person enters in a condition where he or she is filled with the law (Феофан Затворник, святитель, 2008, 366, 384), one has restored the wholeness or integrity of his or her person.

Reciprocity. Especially important this principle is for Caritative social worker as human being is a being of relations, and he or she is driven by faith-motivated assistance to the neighbour. For him or her there exist two ethical maxims that constitutes “investing” of himself in the fellow neighbour, the social dimension of his or her activity: a) biblical message of Christ that one should act for the sake of “the least of My brothers” (Matthew 25: 35-36, 40), namely, for the sake of socially “the least one”, the socially excluded one, the poor, the person who is unprovided for by society; and other maxima b) *If you do not love your brother, who is in front of you, how can you love God, Whom you do not see?* (paraphrased from 1st Epistle of John 4:20), thus showing that personal relationships with God includes at the same time rich inter-subjective aspects in community of people (see Horuzhy, 2006: Crisis of Classical European Ethics in the Prism of Anthropology), reciprocity as responsibility for the other. Taken together, these ethical maxims constitutes the basis for reciprocity in relations.

Work as a mission. Engaging oneself in work for the good of community, person directs his or her personal energies towards goal, with this breaking the mechanisms of barriers of a person, going out of one’s own inner isolation so that a person may start forming trustworthy and safe social relationships, and in that way to renew his or her social functioning.

Philosopher and anthropologist Tzvetan Todorov says, “human nature is to be seen as flexible for radical transformations, if it awakens in person God’s created latent abilities and the necessity for action” (see Todorov, 2001). But how social entrepreneurship can bring into motion a person socially – his or her mind, heart, will making him or her more active?

First of all, by respecting a human dignity, respecting the needs of people, seeing them and advocating them in the common activity of social enterprise, thus putting the social objectives above profit making. When one person devotes him or herself to the other person in need, then in the fact of devotion itself there is already included and working a hope – specifically for the other, which allows a person to believe in self. *Secondly*, a person gets to know him or herself when being engaged in common activity with others of trying to solve problems – in communication with others seeing his or her enemies of inner nature: ability/disability to taking care of others (or taking responsibility), freedom from fears, aggression, anger, superstitions or captivity from them – thus testing the level of inner freedom; as well the practice of taking responsibility and readiness for necessary changes in one’s own personality, or refusal to work with oneself, which leaves a negative impact to all common activity. Here of importance comes the principle of *empowerment* – entrusting the others with necessary skills for reaching their own set goals and setting them free from the assistance from outside. *Thirdly*, stimulating the creativity of a person, developing new or undeveloped skills. Through the process of creativity person gains belief in a personal self, observing the unnoticed or forgotten talents and developing them for the common good of enterprise. Creativity here functions as the general approach in social entrepreneurship to finding the innovative solutions for solving the individual and social problems. This aspect of creativity as the general approach in social entrepreneurship is of special relevance because only creativity allows finding the innovative solutions for solving life-relevant issues of the people in social enterprises in the ways that are not making a person more dependent or addicted to the assistance provided but ensures the freedom of personality or, in other words, renews person’s spiritual and social functioning.

But in this situation there exist *two risks*. First of all, how to awaken one's awareness to willingly "invest" oneself in the other person, to open eyes to the real needs of the other and have willingness to help? Here again we come to the principle of *reciprocity* – as the situation of poverty of the other is able to awaken reciprocity, compassion for the other. When a person sees real people, real situation of them, then reciprocity, compassion is awakened, and it is awakened by practical activity. Human attitude towards people who are in appalling sufferings or needs like litmus shows a person's readiness or immaturity to do something about it. So it is a person's existential reaction to the challenge of sufferings in the lives of others, from which there can be born a reciprocity, compassion for the others, a motivation – so needed for organizing oneself for solving life-relevant issues of the people in social enterprises.

When reciprocity between people is born, it opens doors for expressing love to the other in practical activity or concern. It allows to accept the other, and thus reciprocity is exactly what is needed for overcoming inner isolation of a person, gaining of belief that there exist trustworthy relationships with others. Where love is expressed as practical solidarity and concern among people, there economy becomes a tool of solidarity as the aim of social enterprise is to provide assistance in solving life-relevant issues of the people – individually and commonly. From this the charity is born, which helps as motivation.

Reciprocity born allows supporting the other when he or she experiences a fall or failure, catching up the other when he or she falls down – as from the success of an individual person in the social enterprise depends the success of all enterprise (the contribution of everyone in the enterprise is essential as in the process of communication there are revealed the talents of everyone involved).

Second risk is that the very **intervenor** – social worker or social entrepreneur – **is in crisis** himself and cannot reach the other person, client. One of the reasons may be the awareness of intervenor his or her personality is self-sufficient. But the very intervenor or worker is a person with the same challenges for his personality as is his client or fellow human being. If a worker is not spiritually functioning then he or she cannot spiritually address to other person. This risk stays for all professionals of the helping professions, and Caritative social worker is subjected to this risk as well. Consequently, here appears the so called *binding reciprocity* – a practitioner cannot ask from the other person changes in personality if he or she is not undergoing the inner changes of similar nature in his or her personality as well. Otto Scharmer, the leadership theoretician, illustrates this axiom by quoting William O'Brien, late CEO of *Hanover Insurance*, when asked summing up his most important learning experience in leading profound change, namely, "the success of intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervenor" (*see* Scharmer, 2010).

What a specialist should do? When a specialist works with people, clients, he or she should have the necessary knowledge in anthropology, human understanding in wholeness, taking into consideration the fact that the object of social action is not the impersonal social problem but his or her own personality with its lifestory, situation of life, and with the same necessity to grow, to find stability in his or her self-esteem and humanity. To specialist similarly applies the stimulation of aspects of God-likeness of his or her own personality. Secondly, one needs to have competence of caritative communication, namely, to see the other person as partner for cooperation that asks for implementation of reciprocity, in which specialist is not an instructor but a fellow

companion – who him or herself in the given situation is growing and improving. Thirdly, in order this process may happen, the very caritative worker should have to start with his or her own spiritual life, centre of which is belonging to the Church and its sacraments, what is the main precondition for sustainable professional activity. As the Holy hierarch Theophan the Recluse indicates, without noble ideals in Christianity in order to help a person there is a need also for strength and know-how to act – there is a need for active, working wisdom (Teofans Vientuļnieks, 2009, 9). Therefore the basic task is the true life in the spirit of Christ – uniting with Christ's divine life in the Church. Christian life is the way how the **active, working communication** with God is being sustained in the Person of Jesus Christ – by fulfilling with the help of God's grace in one's life the holy will of God (Ibid., 11).

Theophan the Recluse all in all defines Christian faith as divine communication and active, working communication. For that there is a need for struggle with oneself – a willingness and activity to persecute the sin in one's life and decisively strive for purity and cleanness, because in a person's heart all the time there accumulates unchastity and immorality that leads off the love towards people (Ibid., 15). Such a person is no more a giver and realizer of reciprocity.

Therefore in a specialist, in which there has started his or her own spiritual life, there appears awareness that all answers are not to be found in him or herself alone, that he or she is not self-sufficient. Nowadays in the helping human professions there is a growing discussion about the increasing necessity toward knowing oneself, toward the skills of self-reflection that would allow to become clear about one's motivation, to cleanse the motivation – what is the goal of my work? It is possible to help the other if a worker forms in oneself a caritative attitude – full of respect and compassion toward the other person. Cooperation, communication, and the common quest for truth is possible if a worker manages the culture of confession of sins, universal communication – prayer, and is capable for *substitutional place-taking* for the sake of his or her clients. Substitutional place-taking² here is the practice of supporting the other in the way that he or she is encouraged to recover lost spiritual and moral abilities, faith in a personal self that is needed for a decent self-esteem and for activity together.

Such a worker who sees the other person in his or her wholeness and attributes to him or herself the same qualities, which he asks from others, in the field of social work and in community of social entrepreneurship serves as an element of bringing renewal.

Stimulating anyone of the earlier mentioned aspects of *God-likeness* by professional or entrepreneurial activity together with reciprocal responsibility of a practitioner for the same spiritual goals as for the other person he or she is addressing, it is possible to stimulate spiritual stability, inner growth and human potential of the other – his or her possibility to become more *human*. In that way social entrepreneurship with its mechanisms and application of its constituting principles in practice helps developing a human potential, and can be seen in the context as instrumental tool, method of social work – as the goal of Caritative social work and social entrepreneurship is the stabilization of a person's life by activating spiritual and social functioning of a person.

Conclusions

Raising citizens to the status of active protagonists of their own destiny, gives possibility for people in the areas dominated by the so called 'social depression' to overcome it by organizing themselves in groups of social initiatives. In Latvia as an example for it serves the movement of *Local Initiative Groups* (VRG) and community foundations as a promoter and initiator of (productive) community initiatives. Having accumulated enough social capital this initiative may accept and develop into form of *Social entrepreneurship*, which, being the European Commission's promoted concept of 'a different approach to entrepreneurship', brings original initiative as part of non-market sub-sector of Social Economy in the market or business sub-sector of Social economy, as well as being one of the social technologies of Caritative social work for social cohesion of disadvantaged and marginalized groups of society. Article has also showed the anthropological principles of people's motivation and engaging in social enterprises as well as principles of activating person's inner resources and human potential.

SE organizations have had and have a fundamental role in the improvement of social cohesion, especially in local communities for overcoming 'social depression'. Sometimes they represent possibility of economic survival in a region as is the case of agricultural cooperatives; in other situations, they are the only viable way to solve a social problem. However, SE in Latvia is still a diffused, newly-emerged concept. The existing studies comprise only some particular parts of it making difficult to identify it as a whole. The particular interest of the author of the study is grouped around the possibilities of SE principles attributed to the sphere of social welfare and particularly to that of social work, especially local initiatives dealing with the new social needs – social cohesion of disadvantaged and marginalized groups of society. As the overview of selected community initiatives in western and eastern parts of Latvia showed, there are appearing initiatives that could be characterized as players in the newly emerging sphere of Social Economy, being (1) placed in the sphere of productive economy on the scale of a community (2) by the very marginal people involved in initiatives, (3) administered as small businesses, (4) controlled by the people involved and (5) supported by social services and social workers. The last aspects ask for more research in detail in order to develop the more thorough vision of recognition the principles of SE in Latvia as well as for attributing these principles to the sphere of social work in Latvia. Therefore of special importance grows the need for exploring the role of social, Caritative social and community workers, and other representatives of the helping professions at national level in assisting marginal people to come out of stagnation or isolation and to become active/productive in solving their social, economic, and personal problems.

Measuring the achieved result of common activity & people's associations in terms of social capital, non-monetary income or service and social added value becomes of importance as well as 1) exploring ways for activating person's inner resources and human potential in the activities of Social entrepreneurship, and 2) finding ways how the existing legislation can be revised and obstacles removed allowing the people to help themselves in the organized communitarian ways of overcoming social problems, becoming *empowered* in communities in the forms and enterprises of Social Economy that have been discussed in this paper.

REFERENCES

- 1 When applying for a loan, a borrower needs forming a group of five from neighbourhood agreeing to meet with the group once a week; others in group cannot having next loans of one in the group is late in his payments, as it has been in the case of Grameen bank [Rural Bank] in Bangladesh.
- 2 See the elaboration of principle of *place-taking* in the article of K. Kießling “Deacony – presence on the spirit of God’s solidarity” in these Proceedings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. CECCOOP. (2006) *Social enterprises and worker cooperatives: Comparing models of corporate governance and social Inclusion*. CECCOOP European Seminar, Manchester.
2. Cooperatives Europe. (2006) *Performance report 2006*. [online] [cited 2015-05-23]. Available: <http://www.coopseurope.coop/>
3. *Law of European Cooperative Society* effective from 23.11.2006 (Eiropas kooperatīvo sabiedrību likums, “Latvijas Vēstnesis” 180 (3548), 09.11.2006.)
4. *Promotion of the Role of Associations and Foundations in Europe*. (1997) Commission of the European Communities. Luxembourg: Office of official publication of the European Communities. COM(97)241 Final.
5. *Report on a European Social Model for the future* (2005/2248(INI)) (2006). Committee on Employment and Social Affairs. Rapporteur: Jose Albino Silva Peneda, Proinsias De Rossa. Final (A6-0238/2006).
6. *Report on Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation in combating unemployment* (2014/2236(INI)) (30.07.2015.) by Committee on Employment and Social Affairs. Rapporteur: Verónica Lope Fontagné, 16 p.
7. *Social Business Initiative – Creating a favourable climate for social enterprises, key stakeholders in the social economy and innovation {SEC(2011) 1278 final}*. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. 25.10.2011 COM(2011) 682 final [online]. – European Commission, Brussels, 13 p. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/social_business/docs/COM2011_682_en.pdf
8. *Sociālo pakalpojumu un sociālās palīdzības likums* [Law of Social Services and Social Assistance] (31.10.2002.) [publ./ publ.: “Latvijas Vēstnesis”, 168 (2743), 19.11.2002., “Ziņotājs”, 23, 12.12.2002.] [stājas spēkā/ comes into force: 01.01.2003.].
9. *Study on the implementation of the Regulation 1435/2003 on the Statute for European Cooperative Society (SCE)*. (2010). Final Study Executive Summary and Part I: Synthesis and comparative report, 5 October 2010, pp. 1-319; Final Study Part II. National Reports, 5 October 2010, pp. 320-998.
10. *The Charter of Principles of the Social Economy promoted by the European Standing Conference on Cooperatives, Mutual Societies, Associations and Foundations (CEP-CMAF) CIRIEC* (2000).
11. *The Social Economy in the European Union (CESE/COMM/05/2005)*. (2007) Report drawn up for the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) by CIRIEC (International Centre of Re-search and Information on the Public, Social and Cooperative Economy, 125 p.

12. *The Social Economy in the European Union: Summary of the Report* (2007), drawn up for the European Economic and Social Committee by CIRIEC (International Centre of Research and Information on the Public, Social and Cooperative Economy (DI CESE 96/2007 EN/o), September 2007, 26 p.

Studies

13. Banks S., Butcher H., Henderson P. Robertson J. (eds.). (2003) *Managing Community Practice: Principles, policies and programmes*. Great Britain: The Policy Press, 208 p.
14. Borzaga C. & Defourny J. (eds.). (2001) *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*. London: Routledge.
15. Bouchard Marie J. (2010a) Introduction. The Worth of Social Economy. In: *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective/* CIRIEC (Ed. by M. J. Bouchard). Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang, pp. 11-19.
16. Bouchard Marie J. (2010b) The evaluation of the social economy in Quebec, with regard to stake-holders, mission and organization identity. In: *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective/* CIRIEC (Ed. by M. J. Bouchard). Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang, pp. 111-133.
17. Conference of European Churches. *Theme 3: Building sustainable communities*. [online] [cited 23.05.2015.]. Available: <http://www.cec-kek.org/>
18. Defourny J. & Campos J. (1992) *Économie sociale (entre économie capitaliste et économie publique) / The Third Sector (cooperatives, mutual and nonprofit organizations)*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Université – CIRIEC.
19. Defourny J. & Nyssens M. (eds.). (2008) Social Enterprise in Europe: Recent Trends and Developments. In: *Working Papers Series*, No. 08/01, Liège: EMES European Research Network, 40 p.
20. Enjolras Bernard. (2010) The Public Policy paradox. Normative Foundations of Social Economy and Public Policies. Which Consequences for Evaluating Strategies? In: *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective/* CIRIEC (Ed. by Marie J. Bouchard). Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang, pp. 43-62.
21. Evers A., Laville J. L. (2004) *The third sector in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
22. Gūtmane Skaidrīte. (2009) Karitatīvā sociālā darba metodoloģiskā paradigma [The methodological paradigm of Caritative social work]. In: *Latvian Christian Academy Scientific Proceedings, No.2: European Social Development: Sacred Foundations of Europe. Social Dialogue. Solidarity. Migration. Cohesion*. Jūrmala: Latvian Christian Academy, pp. 31-41.
23. Mayo M. (1994) *Communities and Caring: The mixed economy of welfare*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 242 p.
24. Yunus Muhammad. (2008) *How legal steps can help to pave the way to ending poverty? (September 24, 2008)*. [online] [cited 2012-05-23]. Available: <http://www.muhammadyunus.org/>; http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/winter08/yunus_winter08.htm/
25. Richez-Battesti N., Trouve H., Rousseau F., Eme B., Fraisse L. (2010) Evaluating the social and solidarity-based economy in France. In: *The Worth of the Social Economy. An International Perspective/* CIRIEC (ed. by M. J. Bouchard). Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang, pp. 87-111.

26. Scharmer Otto. (2010) [online] *The Blind Spot of Institutional Leadership: How to create deep innovation through moving from Egosystem to Ecosystem Awareness*. Paper prepared for: World Economic Forum, Annual Meeting of the New Champions, Tianjin, People's Republic of China, September 2010 [cited 15.01.2016]. Available: http://www.ottoscharmer.com/sites/default/files/2010_DeepInnovation_Tianjin.pdf
27. *Social Economy and MSE enterprises in EU*. [online] Project "Innovative Vocational Training Approaches In Social Economy Small and Micro Enterprises" website [cited 23.05.2015.]. Available: <http://tsesme.org/>

Sources of community initiatives

28. *Apkaimes attīstības rokasgrāmata* [Community development handbook] (2007)/ Aut. kolekt.: I. Danga, I. Stalidzāne, A. Damberga, A. Pastore, A. Bērziņš. Valmiera: Valmieras novada fonds, 57 lpp.
29. *Community foundations in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania* (2005)/ Comp. by A. Rehema, I. Danga, V. Girdzijauskas & I. Avik. Tartu: Triip, 36 p.
30. Data basis of Zemgale NGO Support Centre, North-Kurland NGO Support centre and Soros Foundation Latvia.
31. Kurzemes NVO publicitātes e-brošūra 2011 [Kurland region NGOs publicity e-booklet 2011] [online]/ Sast./Comp.by I. Siliņa. Talsi: Ziemeļkurzemes NVO atbalsta centrs [North-Kurland NGOs Support Centre], 138 lpp. [cited 2012-05-23]. Available: <http://www.zkcentrs.lv/>
32. *Kopienu veiksmes grāmata* [Community success book] (2008). Daugavpils: Lauku attīstības centrs [Rural development center], 43 p.
33. *Kopā var paveikt vairāk! Publiskās un privātās partnerības veicināšana, iesaistot nevalstiskās organizācijas* [brošūra] [Together we can achieve more! Promoting of public and private partnership, by involving NGOs]. Rīga: Latvijas Kopienu iniciatīvu fonds [Latvian Foundation of Community Initiatives], 40 lpp.

Sources in anthropology

34. Horuzhy Sergey. (2006) [online] *Crisis of Classical European Ethics in the Prism of Anthropology*. Institute of Synergetic Anthropology, Russia [cited 09.05.2015.] Available: http://synergia-isa.ru/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/hor_crisis_ethics.pdf
35. Teofans Vientuļnieks, svētnieks [Theophan the Recluse, holy hierarch]. (2009) *Ceļš uz pestīšanu (Īss askētiskas apraksts)* [The path to salvation (Concise description of asceticism)]. Rīga: Latvijas Pareizticīgās Baznīcas Sinode [Riga: The Synod of the Latvian Orthodox Church], 345 p.
36. Todorov Tzvetan. (2001) *Life in common. An essay in general anthropology*/ transl. by K. & L. Golsan. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 173 p.
37. Журавский Иоанн, прот. (1995) *Тайна Царствия Божия или забытый путь истинного Богопознания (о внутреннем христианстве)* [Zhuravsky John, protopresbyter. The Mystery of Kingdom of God or the Forgotten Path of Genuine Knowing God (About inner Chirstianity)]. Рига: [б. и.] [Riga: without publisher], 240 p.
38. Феофан Затворник, святитель [Theophan the Recluse, holy hierarch]. (2008) *Воплощенное домостроительство. Опыт христианской психологии* [The embodied [divine] economy. Experience of Christian psychology]. Москва: Правило веры [Moscow: The Rule of Faith], 462 p. – (Духовное наследие святителя Феофана Затворника [The spiritual legacy of Holy hierarch Theophan the Recluse]).

Sociālās ekonomikas principu atpazīstamība kopienu iniciatīvu aktivitātēs Latvijā

Kopsavilkums

Raksts analizē Sociālās ekonomikas (SE) principus un iespēju attīstīt inovatīvas sociālās tehnoloģijas sabiedrības sociālai kohēzijai ekonomiskās krīzes apstākļos. SE koncepts var tikt uzskatīts par Eiropas Sociālā modeļa vērtībās balstītu tradīciju un izaicinājumu rast un pielietot sociālās kohēzijas ilgtspējīgas formas nacionālā līmenī. Raksta mērķis un objekts ir izpētīt, kuras SE sfēras un principi ir atrodami kopienu iniciatīvās Latvijā, nosakot atpazīstamības līmeni SE konceptuālai izpratnei un praksei nacionālā līmenī, pētot trešā sektora un NVO aktivitātes Latvijā. Pārskats par izvēlētajām kopienu iniciatīvām atklāj, ka pastāv iniciatīvas, kuras (1) atrodas produktīvās ekonomikas sfērā kopienu līmenī, (2) tajās iesaistās paši marginālo grupu cilvēki, (3) tās tiek administrētas kā mazā biznesa uzņēmumi (4) un tās kontrolē paši iesaistītie cilvēki pēc demokrātiskiem principiem, (5) un to centienus atbalsta sociālie darbinieki, ar mērķi palīdzēt cilvēkiem pārvarēt sociālo izstumtību.

Noslēdzošā daļa parāda sociālo uzņēmējdarbību kā vienu no sociālajām tehnoloģijām, kā karitatīvā sociālā darba formu marginalizēto sabiedrības grupu sociālajā kohēzijā, kā arī antropoloģisko perspektīvu attiecībā uz cilvēka personas iekšējo resursu un cilvēkpotenciāla atjaunošanu sociālo uzņēmumu aktivitātēs.

Atslēgas vārdi: Sociālās ekonomikas principi, sociālā iekļaušana, kooperatīvi, savstarpējās sabiedrības, asociācijas, kopienu iniciatīvas, produktivitāte, sociālā uzņēmējdarbība, karitatīvais sociālais darbs, Dieva tēls un līdzība cilvēkā, cilvēkpotenciāls, iekšējie resursi, savstarpība.



Mag. theol. Valters Dolacis

Lecturer at Latvian Christian Academy,
Head of Lifelong learning department at LCA
Researcher of Interdisciplinary Research Institute (LCA)

Latvijas Kristīgās akadēmijas lektors,
Mūžizglītības nodaļas vadītājs LKrA
Starpdisciplinārā Pētniecības institūta pētnieks (LKrA)

Address: Vienības prospekts 23, Jūrmala, LV-2010, Latvija
E-mail: kursi@kra.lv



Mag. sc. ing. Ingrīda Jespere

Lecturer at Riga College of Accounting and Finance (Latvia)
Grāmatvedības un finanšu koledžas lektore (Latvija)

Address: Krišjāņa Barona iela 11-9, Rīga, LV-1050, Latvija
E-mail: ingrida-jespere@inbox.lv