

Kvorachkin T.N.

**REPRODUCTION OF HUMAN CAPITAL IN THE CONTEXT OF
AMORTIZATION OF INTANGIBLE ASSETS OF THE ENTERPRISE**

The paper investigates the mechanism of reimbursement of costs to the owner of human capital through depreciation deductions. The author believes that the composition of costs should include not wages, but the cost of labor, which was quantitatively determined by the time the contract was concluded between the capitalist and the owner of human capital.

For the purpose of maintenance to the proprietor of the human capital of social and economic guarantees of the expanded reproduction in work the hypothesis of compensation of expenses to the proprietor of the human capital by means of the amortization mechanism is investigated. The salary as a source of reproduction of the human capital is internally inconsistent. We consider that the structure of costs should join not a salary, but a cost of labor which was known by the time of the contract conclusion between the capitalist and the proprietor of the human capital.

Key words: wages, source of reproduction, expanded reproduction, depreciation.

Keywords: salary, the reproduction source, the expanded reproduction, amortization, the human capital.

In a market economy, there is an order according to which the simple reproduction of fixed capital (in terms of tools) is carried out at the expense of the depreciation fund. This fund, from the point of view of theory, is formed as a result of the transfer of the cost of fixed capital to the finished product. In the opinion of practitioners, this process is nothing more than the fact of accounting for depreciation deductions, that is, an accounting entry on the corresponding accounts. The rates of depreciation deductions are approved by law by the government and tend to increase. The formed amortization fund has a target character and can only be spent on overhaul of the elements of fixed capital and on their replacement at the end of their service life.

Thus, the owner of the means of production has a guaranteed source of simple reproduction of the objects of his property, used for the production of goods and services. And this guarantee is given by society and at the expense of society. As for the expanded reproduction of fixed capital, this problem is solved by using part of the profit and other internal sources, as well as by attracting credit resources.

K. Marx calls the owner of labor power and the owner of the means of production equal commodity owners and legally equal persons. But the owner of the labor force does not have such guarantees. His ability to work is reproduced only from one source - that part of the added value that he receives from the owner of the means of production in the form of wages. This source is guaranteed by society only in part (in the amount of the minimum wage, which cannot even ensure its simple reproduction, in the broad sense of this problem). Two approaches to the reproduction of property objects of the capitalist and the employee are reflected in the socio-economic categories "equality" and "inequality-rule". These categories are widely used in the social sciences (and especially) in economics. Economic equality and economic inequality are categories that, in our opinion, express different economic conditions and relations. To clarify their content, let us turn to the semantics of these words. So, in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language V.I. Dahl. indicates: "equality, state, property of equal; similarity, complete similarity in quantity, or size, or quality "[2, p.6]. As you can see, equality has both quantitative and qualitative definiteness. In the context of our research, we are interested in the qualitative definition of the category "equality". In our opinion,

Economic equality can be viewed from both subjective and objective points of view. On the subjective side, economic equality is the right to an individual choice of the type of activity, in other words, the implementation of this right based on personal preferences. For example, the participation of an individual in social production is carried out in accordance

with the Constitution of the Russian Federation, which states that "Everyone has the right to freely dispose of his ability to work, choose his type of activity and profession" [5, p. 12].

Economic equality is reduced to the simple fact that people are by nature equal to each other, since she laid in them a program for the reproduction of needs, in other words, their systematic satisfaction. Economic inequality occurs when formal rules provide for the satisfaction of one and the same need for some - through one mechanism, and for others - another. In the language of mathematical logic, equality can be expressed as a relation, when everything that belongs to one of the objects (factors of production) is fully related to the other [6, p.440], if their nature allows.

The equality relation is characterized by the following axioms. The first is reflexivity, which means: "For all x , x is equal to x ." If for all elements of the means of labor the same method of compensating for their depreciation (depreciation) is used, then there is equality between them. The second is symmetry, which means: "For all x and for all y , if x is equal to y , then y is equal to x ." In other words, if the same cost recovery method is used for all owners of these instruments of labor and owners of a given quality of labor, then, according to this principle, there is equality from the point of view of any of them. The third is transitivity, its content is as follows: "For all x , for all y and for all z , if x is equal to y and y is equal to z , then x is equal to z ."

This axiom in the aspect of our research reads like this: for all owners of tools, intangible assets and labor, if the owners of the tools use the amortization method of reimbursing the costs of their property, as well as the owners of intangible assets, and the latter as owners of labor, then owners of tools of labor in terms of cost recovery are on an equal footing with owners of labor.

In a modern market economy, economic equality in its qualitative definition is absent. Thus, we are dealing with its opposite - inequality. Inequality in the aspect of reimbursement of costs by the owner of factors of production as a result of their production use is always a different degree of risky activity. The owner of the means of production in the process of using them does not take any effort to preserve their value, and, consequently, their simple reproduction.

The conditions for the reproduction of labor power for its owner are different. For these purposes, he must: a) sell his labor power and b) directly participate in the production process, since without his participation, the use of labor power for known reasons is impossible. The remuneration for his participation in social production is income in the form of wages, on the basis of which the fund of subsistence is formed, which is, in essence, the source of not only simple, but also extended reproduction of labor. The capitalist's profit and the wages of the owner of the labor force have as their source the same income - added value, but according to the degree of risk of obtaining the most risky income is wages.

The risks of receiving a wage sufficient for expanded reproduction of the labor force are associated with many circumstances. First, this is the prevailing point of view on wages as a cost item. This view stems from the fact that the capitalist, according to J.-B. Say, this is "a person who takes at his own expense and risk and in his favor to produce any product" [14, p.202]. He bears certain costs, the main item of which is wages. Moreover, in certain situations, the state itself pursues a policy of restraining incomes, moreover, only in relation to wages. Secondly, it is the determination of the level of wages based on subjective approaches, or rather, on the basis of the subjective law of marginal productivity. Thus, in the modern economy, we have two mechanisms for reimbursing the owners of factors. Consequently, there is a contradiction arising from economic inequality: the contradiction between wages as a cost item from the point of view of the capitalist, and wages as part of the national income, from the point of view of society. The resolution of this contradiction is possible only on condition that the element of costs is not wages, but the cost of labor.

In the economic literature, there are no special studies devoted to the genesis of depreciation. Some authors argue that the emergence of depreciation as a process and as an economic category is due to rent. "It can be considered an established fact," writes A. Orlov,

“that historically depreciation arose from rent. This idea is indirectly confirmed in the very term "amortization", the original meaning of which meant "debt repayment" [10, p.95].

On the basis of the openly dual nature of labor, Karl Marx came to the conclusion that the hired worker, with his concrete labor, transfers the value of fixed capital to the newly created goods. In this regard, he writes: “... in its abstract general property, like the expenditure of human labor, the work of the spinner adds a new value to the value of cotton and spindles, and in its specific, special, useful property, like the spinning process, it transfers the value to the product of these means of production and thus preserves their value in the product. Hence the duality of the result of labor performed at the same time” [8, p.211-212]. This is the theoretical explanation of those practical actions that are carried out today in practice with the cost of fixed capital. In other words, with the appearance of its value in the value of the goods and, naturally,

Representatives of neoclassical theory investigate only the practical side of solving this problem, since, as is known, they are not engaged in clarifying the essence of economic phenomena. We believe that simple reproduction of human capital should also be carried out on the basis of its depreciation. In this regard, it is necessary to consider the question: does the nature of human capital allow for its physical and moral deterioration? The modern economic literature gives a positive answer to this question. At the same time, there are still no special, comprehensive studies in which this problem was solved not only theoretically, but also practically. We only wish to consider it in terms of production and try to formulate the theoretical and methodological foundations of its solution. When solving the problem of reimbursing the physical and moral depreciation of human capital through the depreciation mechanism, it is necessary, in our opinion, to proceed from the methodological principle of distinguishing between the value of human capital and wages. It is necessary to clearly define what value will be amortized - the cost of labor or wages. In the literature, the point of view is expressed that the cost basis for the amortization of human capital should be wages. For example, K. Markarian believes that in wages it is necessary to allocate a share corresponding to the amortization of human capital and its profits [7, p. 35]. It is necessary to clearly define what value will be amortized - the cost of labor or wages. In the literature, the point of view is expressed that the cost basis for the amortization of human capital should be wages. For example, K. Markarian believes that it is necessary to allocate a share in wages that corresponds to the amortization of human capital and its profits [7, p. 35]. It is necessary to clearly define what value will be amortized - the cost of labor or wages. In the literature, the point of view is expressed that the cost basis for the amortization of human capital should be wages. For example, K. Markarian believes that it is necessary to allocate a share in wages that corresponds to the amortization of human capital and its profits [7, p. 35].

In our opinion, the cost of human capital is subject to amortization for many reasons. First, wages are a part of added value, national income; they cannot be a cost item, like profit. Second, wages are more flexible, since they deviate from value under the influence of a system of factors (focused on supply and demand) that differ from those that determine the value of human capital. Thirdly, in neoclassical theory, no attempts are made to reduce the value of human capital to wages, since the latter is only a part of the income (albeit overwhelming) received by the owner of human capital.

The problem can be viewed in terms of both the Marxist and the neoclassical field. As you know, K. Marx proceeded from the fact that the cost of labor power at the time of the transaction between the capitalist and the employee has already been determined. The cost of labor in the Marxist concept is determined, as is known, by the fund of subsistence necessary for the reproduction of the worker himself and his family. In turn, this fund is formed under the influence of a huge number of factors, the most significant of which are the following: health, education, the need to create a family, national traditions and others. Expressed in monetary form, this fund appears on the surface of phenomena in the form of the price of labor power, that is, wages, which can deviate from its objective basis in one direction or another, depending on the ratio of supply and demand.

“If supply and demand cover each other,” writes K. Marx, “then, other things being equal, the price fluctuation stops. But then the supply and demand cease to explain, whatever” [8, p.548]. In this case, given the equality of supply and demand, the price of labor is its price, determined regardless of the ratio of supply and demand. It, in our opinion, is determined by the price of the fund of living means. This is an objective value, and, therefore, “This average value, of course, should be determined differently than the mutually compensating deviations from it are determined” [8, p.548]. This value is nothing more than the price of labor power, which dominates and regulates the spontaneous market prices. For a practical solution to the problem of amortization of human capital, it is necessary to determine its value on an objective basis. We believe,

Currently, the problem of measuring human capital has taken a worthy place in socio-economic research. However, all the models used for solving this important problem do not give significant results. This is due to the fact that the used models for measuring human capital did not reveal a significant correlation of its growth either in time or in the cross-country context. In our opinion, this is due to the fact that all the models used are developed based on the need to determine the amount of human capital. The quantitative approach is dictated by the recognition of human capital as part of the artificially created and reproduced national wealth.

Today, three approaches to measuring human capital are best known. The first is based on the calculation by summing up the costs incurred in the past aimed at its formation. Investment in a person can be measured both in kind and in value. The most important disadvantage of this method is the impossibility of accounting for implicit and indirect costs, and on the other hand, the relationship between the costs incurred and the results obtained, which cannot be quantified (in many cases). The second approach focuses on measuring human capital by assessing the return, the benefit received today, but related to the human capital created in the past. However, it is known that benefits are both monetary and non-monetary. The latter are very difficult to take into account when measuring human capital. For example, a graduate of a prestigious university who graduated with honors has a large stock of human capital. One of the cases of its non-monetary benefits is the reduction in the risk of unemployment. This method, as a rule, is based on accounting for monetary returns, and, therefore, reduces the amount of accumulated human capital.

The third approach is based on a direct assessment of those properties of the population that can be attributed to human capital. However, it has not found wide application for reasons associated with technical and methodological difficulties, in particular, associated with the allocation and justification of the number of properties of the population to be taken into account; development of a methodology for their assessment, bringing diverse indicators to a common denominator.

The fourth approach is to measure human capital using indices. The results obtained based on the above approaches are characterized by huge discrepancies. I. Soboleva believes “... that the sources of the discrepancy between the results lie at the level of the theoretical concept ...” [12, p.55]. All approaches, in her opinion, “... are initially aimed at measuring the mismatched subsystems of human abilities and properties. With a direct assessment, the object of measurement becomes the entire potential of a person, regardless of its origin and relevance. Measurement by the amount of investment is aimed at a reproducible subsystem of abilities and properties created under the influence of special efforts. The recoil measurement encompasses part of what is created artificially, and part of what is genetically inherent is given by nature.

Agreeing with the point of view of S. Soboleva about the insufficient conceptual security of the approaches and methods used for measuring human capital, it should be noted that all approaches compare the costs and benefits, the costs incurred for the formation of human capital with the utility obtained in the form of monetary and non-monetary income. Since utility is an objective value determined by the consumer, and as for human capital, it is its buyer, that is, the owner of the enterprise, then the assessment of the value of human

capital is carried out at this level with the same errors as utility, since until now Since then, neoclassical theory has not offered a satisfactory method for measuring it.

In our opinion, the problem of measuring human capital can be successfully solved only within the framework of projects at the national level. At the same time, approaches, methods and programs for solving this problem require development under the auspices of the state by specialized institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The labor theory of value will become the methodological core of the concept of measuring human capital. The regulation of practical processes should, in our opinion, be carried out on the basis of the use of the law of value. The operation of this law indicates not only the objective foundations of economic exchange - labor costs, that is, socially necessary working time, but also the mechanism for quantifying them - through the interaction of supply and demand [9, p.472]. Thus, the law of value regulates processes as spheres of production,

The solution to the problem of reproduction and measurement of human capital should, in our opinion, be carried out on the following legal and socio-economic grounds, which require their reconstruction.

The first and most important basis is the recognition by law of the employee's ownership of his human capital. Today this has not been done, probably for the reason that the worker's ability to work cannot be separated from the personality of their bearer.

The second foundation is the unification of National Projects directly related to the formation and development of human capital. This decision will underline the desire of the state to implement a systematic approach to the formation, development and use of human capital. The new nationwide systemic National Project should be called "Human Capital: Its Reproduction and Measurement".

The third basis is the provision of the right to work with constitutional guarantees. To do this, it is necessary to change the wording of article 37, clause 1.

Of the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Instead of the norm "Labor is free" give - "The right to work is guaranteed." Today, the right to life is constitutionally guaranteed. Economically, this guarantee is secured by the right to work. Therefore, the right to work must also be guaranteed constitutionally.

The fourth reason is the change in the status of an employee as a "third-party organization" supplying labor to a producing enterprise to the status of an "internal owner". Today it is an objective necessity.

The fifth basis is the legislative provision of reimbursement of costs to the owner of human capital through the amortization mechanism. This will allow, firstly, to avoid confusion in the formation of the itemized composition of production costs and production costs. Today, the fact that wages is an element of added value, like profit, is not disputed. When buying labor, the contract does not fix wages, but the value of labor, which, as we have already shown, already existed at that moment, and the added value from which wages will be paid has not yet been created. Therefore, the cost of production should include the cost of labor, and wages will act as a profit on human capital. Secondly, the owner of human capital, as well as the owner of the means of production, will receive a guaranteed source of simple reproduction of human capital. As for wages, in our opinion, it will be several times less, however, in any case, it will be a source of expanded reproduction of human capital. Studies of wages as a source of human capital reproduction have shown its internal inconsistency (in terms of its purpose). As a result of our research, we came to the conclusion that the owner of human capital receives a guaranteed source of his simple reproduction, wages will provide an expanded reproduction of human capital, and its size will reflect the real contribution of its recipient to the production of added value. will receive a guaranteed source of simple reproduction of human capital. As for wages, in our opinion, it will be several times less, however, in any case, it will be a source of expanded reproduction of human capital. Studies of wages as a source of human capital reproduction have shown its internal inconsistency (in terms of its purpose). As a result of our research, we came to the conclusion that the owner of human capital receives a guaranteed source of his simple reproduction, wages will provide an expanded reproduction of human capital, and its size will reflect the real contribution of its

recipient to the production of added value. will receive a guaranteed source of simple reproduction of human capital. As for wages, in our opinion, it will be several times less, however, in any case, it will be a source of expanded reproduction of human capital. Studies of wages as a source of human capital reproduction have shown its internal inconsistency (in terms of its purpose). As a result of our research, we came to the conclusion that the owner of human capital receives a guaranteed source of his simple reproduction, wages will provide an expanded reproduction of human capital, and its size will reflect the real contribution of its recipient to the production of added value. however, in any case, it will be a source of expanded reproduction of human capital. Studies of wages as a source of human capital reproduction have shown its internal inconsistency (in terms of its purpose). As a result of our research, we came to the conclusion that the owner of human capital receives a guaranteed source of his simple reproduction, wages will provide an expanded reproduction of human capital, and its size will reflect the real contribution of its recipient to the production of added value. however, in any case, it will be a source of expanded reproduction of human capital. Studies of wages as a source of human capital reproduction have shown its internal inconsistency (in terms of its purpose). As a result of our research, we came to the conclusion that the owner of human capital receives a guaranteed source of his simple reproduction, wages will provide an expanded reproduction of human capital, and its size will reflect the real contribution of its recipient to the production of added value.

LITERATURE

1. Buzgalin A., Kolganov A. *Man, market and capital in the economy of the XXI century* // *Economic Issues*. - 2006. -- S. 125-141.
2. Dal V.I. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language: In 4 volumes* - M.: Rus. yaz., 2002. - T. 4. - 688 p.
3. Dobrynin A., Dyatlov S., Kurgan S. *Methodology for assessing human capital* // *Economics of education. International periodical journal*. - Kostroma. - 1999. - No. 1. - S. 8-19.
4. Kapelyushnikov R. *Theory of human capital*. *Regional Development Strategy Forum* // Internet resource / region forum.ru. 2003.
5. *The Constitution of the Russian Federation*. - M.: Publishing house "Os-89". - P.12.
6. Kondakov N. *Logical Dictionary*. - M.: "Science", 1971. - 649 p.
7. Markarian K. *Human capital in post-industrial society. Abstract of the thesis. dis. for a job. Scientist. Doctoral degrees econom. Sciences* / Moscow State University of Management M., 2005. - 60 p.
8. Marx K., Engels F. - *Works* - 2nd ed. - T. 23. -- 907 p.
9. Marx K., Engels F. *M.: Politizdat*, 1962. - Soch. - T. 25, Part II. - 551 p.
10. Orlov A. *On the economic essence of depreciation* // *Questions of economy*. - 2010. - No. 3. - P.86-96.
11. Semenenko V. *Methodology of modern political economy* // *Economic theory: origins and prospects*. - M.: TEIS. - 2006. -- 999 s.
12. Soboleva I. *Paradoxes of measuring human capital* // *Economic Issues*. - 2009. - No. 9. - P.51-70.
13. Shchetinin V. *Human and material capital: commonality and difference* // *ME and MO*. - 2003. - No. 8. - S. 55-61.
14. *Economic theory: textbook* / ed. A.G. Gryaznova, T.V. Checheleva. - M.: Publishing house "Exam", 2004. - 590s.