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Abstract.

Restriction of the rights of citizens is one of the tools to achieve national security of the territory. This work is aimed at analyzing the readiness of citizens to limit their rights to ensure economic security and taking into account this readiness by the authorities. As an object, the right to receive insurance old-age pension in the Russian Federation was chosen. The choice of this right is due to the demographic aging of the population in all macro-regions of the world and the almost universal increase in the retirement age. The main sources of data were statistical databases of the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation, as well as the results of sociological surveys conducted by public opinion centers and the Institute of Economics of the Karelian Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Data analysis was carried out using the case study method and econometric methods, in particular, panel and correlation analysis. The study showed that the willingness of a significant proportion of Russians to limit civil rights does not extend to the right to receive an old-age insurance pension. At the same time, the authorities poorly took into account the unreadiness of citizens to raise the retirement age. At the same time, the advantages and disadvantages of limiting the right to insurance old-age pensions make the formation of a "smart security" model for the territory, which involves a combination of soft and hard forces, topical.
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Resumen

La restricción de los derechos de los ciudadanos es una de las herramientas para lograr la seguridad nacional del territorio. Este trabajo tiene como objetivo analizar la disposición de los ciudadanos a limitar sus derechos para garantizar la seguridad económica y tener en cuenta esta disposición de las autoridades. Como objeto, se eligió el derecho a recibir un seguro de pensión de vejez en la Federación de Rusia. La elección de este derecho se debe al envejecimiento demográfico de la población en todas las macro regiones del mundo y al aumento casi universal de la edad de jubilación. Las principales fuentes de datos fueron las bases de datos estadísticos del Servicio Federal de Estadística del Estado de la Federación de Rusia, así como los resultados de encuestas sociológicas realizadas por centros de opinión pública y el Instituto de Economía del Centro de Investigación de Carelia de la Academia de Ciencias de Rusia. El análisis de datos se realizó utilizando el método de estudio de caso y métodos econométricos, en particular, el análisis de panel y de correlación. El estudio mostró que la disposición de una proporción significativa de rusos a limitar los derechos civiles no se extiende al derecho a recibir una pensión de seguro de vejez. Al mismo tiempo, las autoridades tuvieron muy poco en cuenta la falta de preparación de los ciudadanos para aumentar la edad de jubilación. Al mismo tiempo, las ventajas y desventajas de limitar el derecho al seguro de pensiones de vejez hacen que la formación de un modelo de "seguridad inteligente" para el territorio, que implica una combinación de fuerzas blandas y duras, sea típica.

Palabras clave: modelo de seguridad resistente; modelo de seguridad suave; poder inteligente; envejecimiento demográfico de la población; elevar la edad de jubilación
Introduction

The basic rights of a Russian citizen are enshrined in the second chapter of the Constitution of the Russian Federation: the right to life (article 20), freedom and personal inviolability (article 22), privacy (article 23) and home (article 25), definition of nationality (article 26), freedom of movement (article 27), use of their abilities and property for entrepreneurial and other activities not prohibited by law (article 34), private property (article 35), work (article 37), social security and state pensions (stat I'm 39), etc.

At the same time, in accordance with Article 55 of the Constitution, in order to ensure the security of the state, it is allowed to limit the rights of a citizen, which is caused by the impossibility of developing and realizing the potential of an individual and maintaining a high quality of life without a stable, supportive environment. Thus, according to the classification of the needs of Abraham Maslow (1954), security is one of the basic human needs (the second level of the pyramid, above basic needs) and without it the satisfaction of needs for love, respect and self-actualization is impossible.

At the same time, it is worth noting that it is possible to limit the rights of a citizen to international practices. In particular, according to Article 29 of the Syracuse Principles on the interpretation of restrictions and derogations from the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the rights of citizens may be limited to ensure national security (territorial integrity and political independence of a country) and public (people’s life and health, their property) (American Association for the International Commission of Jurists, 1985). Of course, it should be understood that the imposed restrictions must be commensurate with the level of threat to the security of the territory - sufficient, but not excessive.

An example of a restriction of rights is the access of federal security service bodies in urgent cases and for official purposes to communications and vehicles owned by citizens, residential premises, etc. Some restrictions are temporary in nature (they apply when martial law is imposed, etc.) or are subject to only part of the territory (border zone, etc.). Some of the existing restrictions regulate the rights of foreign citizens, but indirectly affect the interests of Russians.
The purpose of this article is to analyze the readiness of citizens to limit their rights to ensure economic security and to take this readiness into account by the authorities. As an example, the right to receive an old-age insurance pension in the Russian Federation was chosen.

The urgency of choosing this type of law is due to the fact that the demographic aging of the population has become a serious challenge to the security of countries, especially the developed ones - an increase in the proportion of representatives of the older age groups. If in 1965 the share of the population over 60 years old was 8% on average around the world, in 2017 it was already 13%, while in Europe it was 25%, and in North America it was 22%. In 2017, in the Russian Federation, the proportion of people 60 years and older was 21% (United Nations, 2017), and by 2050 it is projected to increase to 29% (United Nations, 2015).

Demographic aging of the population increases the burden on the budget and extrabudgetary funds, leads to the depletion of the labor potential of the territory (Bloom, Canning & Fink, 2010; Fuchs, 2013), etc. Problems arising in the labor market are mainly solved either by motivating the older population to work, or by restricting the right to receive an old-age insurance pension (Karginova-Gubunova, 2018).

Traditionally, there are two models of security: soft and hard. However, their interpretation varies significantly.

At the heart of the first approach are the terms soft and hard power. The concept of soft power was proposed in 1990 by American political scientist Joseph S. Nye to indicate achievement of the goal through voluntary cooperation based on sympathy and increasing the attractiveness of certain actions (Nye, 1990). In opposition to this concept, the term rigid force used for coercion (violence) has become widespread. In the development of the theoretical apparatus of J.S. Nye (2008) introduced another concept - smart power, a combination of soft and hard power. The concepts of soft and hard power have been
developed in the theory of international relations, including to ensure national and global security (Davydov, 2007). It can be assumed that the model of "smart security" will be formed in the near future.

According to another approach, strict security means military aspects, and soft aspects - non-military: economic, environmental, energy, food, etc. (Borishpolets, Lebedev & Hudaikulova, 2012).

As part of this work, as applied to the economic security of the territory, we will adhere to the first approach, namely, to consider the soft security model as stimulating individuals to match their behavior to role requirements, a hard model - as forcing individuals. At the same time, coercion itself can be carried out through the imposition of additional obligations or the restriction of rights (sometimes these processes are inseparable from each other).

A study conducted in the United States after the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001 showed that the greater the threat, the more people are willing to give up civil liberty in favor of security, but only if they trust the government. As long as the threat level is low, the liberals are less willing than moderate and conservatives are willing to give up civil liberty (Davis & Silver, 2012). At the same time, blind patriotism is associated with conservatism to a certain extent, which is accompanied by increased assessments of threats to national security (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997).

The estimated level of risk is affected by both fear and anger. The study, also carried out after the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, led to the conclusion of an increase in risk assessments and a propensity to take precautions in fear and, accordingly, a decrease in these estimates in anger. Moreover, men tend to be more optimistic than women (Lerner, Gonzalez, Small & Fischhoff, 1997).

Speaking about the problems on the labor market in the conditions of the demographic aging of the population, one can also single out a soft and rigid model.
Soft provides for an increase in motivation for the voluntary continuation of work when you reach retirement age or a voluntary increase in the retirement age itself. Surveys of the older population, conducted by Stefan Stabuli and Josef Zweimuller (2013), indicate that the preservation of employment is estimated as an economically viable solution, but having a negative impact on family life and health. In this regard, the motivation to work depends on both a positive vision of work and the health and social services received at work. William Viatrowski (2001) shows that in the current socio-demographic conditions for the United States, it is effective to provide the older population with a choice of retirement age and, accordingly, income at retirement.

Within the framework of a rigid model, the right to receive an insurance old-age pension is limited. The retirement age rises and, thus, the forced continuation of the labor activity of the older population is ensured. John Shoven and Gopi Goda (2008) calculated possible options for adjusting the retirement age due to an increase in life expectancy. Alexey Kudrin and Yevsey Tomovich Gurvich (2012) also spoke about the need to raise the retirement age given the “age inflation”. The rigid model has been recommended by experts of the International Labor Organization for Western Europe (International Labor Office, 2011) and is currently being implemented by most of the developed countries of the world (Obukhova, Pahunov & Ivanter, 2018).

Raising the retirement age makes it possible to more accurately predict the growth of labor resources involved in the economy. However, the use of this model can be accompanied by a number of negative consequences for the economy - for example, an increase in the number of people with disabilities and, consequently, the cost of their benefits (Duggan, Singleton & Song, 2007).

Other things being equal, an increase in life expectancy should lead to a later retirement (Bloom, Canning, Mansfield & Moore, 2007). However, Klaus Prettner and David Canning (2014) showed that this relationship is not so clear. In particular, the increase in personal optimal retirement age is facilitated by the prospects for an increase in lifelong consumption associated with longer work and the need to compensate for the fall in capital
income. However, thanks to the receipt of compound interest on life-long employment income, the motivation to work can be weakened to the limit, people will strive to enjoy rest.

The foregoing allows us to make a conclusion about the existence of a multiplicity of factors that determine both the need for restriction of rights and the readiness for this of citizens. This work is aimed at complementing earlier studies with findings on the readiness of the population of a particular country, the Russian Federation, to narrow the scope of rights. As part of the tasks, we consider the general consent of citizens to limit their rights and proceed to a detailed analysis of the readiness to limit the right to receive an old-age insurance pension. Conclusions will be made about taking into account this readiness by federal and regional authorities.

**Materials and methods**

The study analyzed statistical data of the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation, the results of sociological surveys conducted by the All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center, the Levada-Center analytical center and the Public Opinion Foundation, as well as by the Institute of Economics of the Karelian Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

A telephone survey of the All-Russian Center for the Study of Public Opinion on the Consent of Restricting Civil Rights for the Most Security of All was conducted on April 9, 2017 and covered 1,600 respondents from more than 80 regions of the Russian Federation. Surveys of the Levada Center analytical center were conducted by personal interviews from 1998 to 2018, the sample was 1,600 from 52 Russian subjects and 136 settlements. On September 9, 2018, 1,500 citizens from 53 subjects and 104 settlements took part in the poll of the Public Opinion Foundation.

A questionnaire survey of the Institute of Economics of the Karelian Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences was held in the fourth quarter of 2017, retirees of the Republic of Karelia, one of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation, were under 72 years of age. Taking into account the total number of pensioners in the region and the
existing criteria of representativeness of the sample (Mogilchak, 2015), it was determined that to obtain reliable indicators, it is enough to cover 400 people. In fact, 527 were polled, 32% more than the required value. The selection of respondents took into account the distribution of the population by sex and age, type of settlement, the ratio between working and non-working pensioners.

Also, the work used data from media monitoring on the reflection of the pension reform, the St. Petersburg Policy Foundation on the public reaction of regional authorities and expert assessments of the level of public solidarization. Thus, the main methods of collecting information have become documented observation (determination of the required indicators based on existing databases) and questioning the older population of the Republic of Karelia. The description and interpretation of changes in the conditions for obtaining the right to the old-age pension is made in the framework of the case study method. Data analysis was carried out using econometrics methods, in particular, panel and correlation analyzes were carried out. The main advantages of the methodology are the use of data from various sociological surveys, which increases the reliability of the conclusions made.

Analysis and Results
The study of the readiness of citizens to limit their rights to ensure national security was carried out on the basis of data from the All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center (Graph 1)

Graph 1. Distribution of answers to the question “Do you agree that new laws should be adopted that provide greater security for all, even if this leads to a restriction of civil rights?” Source: compiled by the author on the basis of: (Russian Public Opinion Research Center, 2017).

The majority of Russians, namely 59%, potentially agree to limit their civil rights for the greater security of the whole society; 35%, almost half as much, do not agree. At the same time, the calculations showed that discrepancies by federal districts, as well as by sex,
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age, education levels and income, the main type of occupation and the size of the populated place of residence are statistically insignificant.
Let us consider the extent to which this readiness extends to the right to receive an old-age insurance pension.

**The right to receive an old-age insurance pension**

**Readiness for restriction and its accounting by federal authorities**

Increasing the retirement age in the Russian Federation was repeatedly recommended by a number of organizations, in particular, the International Monetary Fund (International Monetary Fund, 2017). The law on the phased retirement of state and municipal servants was adopted in 2016, but the Russian authorities reported about the absence of such a bill in relation to all categories of citizens in the middle of March 2018 (Vesti, 2018).

However, on June 14, 2018, this draft federal law was approved by the Government of the Russian Federation of the World (Obukhova, Pahunov & Ivanter, 2018), and then by the decree of June 16, 2018 No. 1206-p was submitted to the State Duma. The above-mentioned document provided for raising the retirement age, by year per year: for men from 60 to 65 years old, for women from 55 to 63 years old.

Accordingly, it can be concluded that the government initially deliberately tried to avoid discussing this issue with the population. Perhaps the reason for this was the presidential election held on March 18, 2018: the Government of the Russian Federation did not want to allow protest sentiments in society. It can be assumed that it was not by chance that the date of consideration in the government and the promulgation of the bill was chosen on June 14, 2018 (The Russian Government, 2018), the day of the opening of the World Cup. Such a "coincidence" could reduce the attention to reform and the number of protest actions in connection with the ban on mass public speeches. However, this point of view was officially refuted (Kommersant, 2018). For all that, the summer (vacation) period did not contribute to a serious study of the bill.
Subsequently, a number of sociological studies showed the unpopularity of the proposed changes in legislation.

Thus, according to a survey conducted by the Levada Center Center on June 22-26, 2018, 89% of Russians reacted negatively to raising the retirement age for men and 90% for women. A positive assessment regarding the increase in the retirement age was given for men by 8%, for women - 7%. From the point of view of the majority, the optimal retirement age for men is 60 years old (87% of respondents), for women it is 55 years old (84%), that is, valid at that time (Levada-Center, 2019a). The population perceived reform as the need to “work up to the grave”, and this was the main reason for the negative attitude towards it (Denisenko et al., 2018).

On August 29, 2018, the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin made an appeal to the citizens and proposed reducing the retirement age for women provided for by the bill from 63 to 60 years. This appeal could be the result of taking into account the reaction of society, and a well-thought-out tactical move to increase loyalty to the draft law.

A certain role in increasing loyalty was also played by the mass media. Within a month after the announcement of the proposed pension reform, from June 14 to July 17, 2018, six federal TV channels of the country (Channel One, Russia 1, Russia 24, NTV, REN TV and TV Center ) 424 plots were published on this topic, 12% of them were positive, the majority (87%) were neutral and some (0.7%) became negative. Despite the fact that the media received information about the recommendation of the Government of the Russian Federation not to use the phrase “pension reform” in the subjects, its frequency of mention was higher than “changes in pension legislation” (even more was the particularity of “raising the retirement age”). Similarly, these issues were covered by the state Russian international information agency RIA Novosti and the Russian news agency TASS (Churakova, Mukhametshina & Bocharova, 2018).
By the end of September 2018, the assessment of the reform was somewhat changed: 85% were against the increase in the retirement period for men and 88% for women (Graph 2). At the same time, in both groups by 7 percentage points was less than those who gave sharply negative estimates. 11% supported reform for men and 9% for women.

At the same time, we note that it is impossible to state the general positive influence of the presidential appeal on the attitude towards pension reform. It did not change the assessment in 57% of respondents, in 34% the ratio worsened and only in 7% it improved.

Russians resigned to the inevitable increase in the retirement age: from August to September, the proportion of those who were most likely ready to take part in mass demonstrations against reform (from 53% to 35%, respectively) significantly decreased (Levada-Center, 2019b).

A) for men up to 65 years

B) or women up to 60 years
Graph 2. Distribution of answers to the question “How do you feel about legislative increase of retirement age?”

In June 2018, the question was raised about raising the retirement age for women to 63 years.
Source: compiled by the author based on: (Levada-Center, 2019b).

The polling data of the Levada-Center analytical center is practically confirmed by polls of the Public Opinion Foundation: on June 24, 2018, only 6% of Russians supported the proposed bill, September 9, 2018 - 11%. At the same time, in June, 49% were against any increase in the retirement age (in September - 44%), 27% (in September - 28%) believed that the increase in the retirement period should not happen now or not (Public Opinion Foundation, 2018).

According to the All-Russian Center for the Study of Public Opinion, among pensioners, representatives of the intelligentsia (teachers, doctors, etc.), who, despite the retirement age, want to continue their work activity, most positively evaluated the reform. From their point of view, a later right to receive an old-age insurance pension will help them keep their jobs (Yakovleva, 2018). At the same time, after the appeal of the President of the
Russian Federation, 55% of respondents did not believe in the probability of protest actions on the territory of their residence (RIA Novosti, 2018).

On September 26, 2018, the State Duma adopted a bill on raising the retirement age with amendments only to the President of the Russian Federation and the United Russia party, other edits were rejected (Zamakhina, 2018). The next day, the bill was adopted in the third reading, on October 3, 2018, it was approved by the Federation Council and signed by the President of the Russian Federation.

It should be noted that the lack of readiness of public authorities for dialogue was aggravated by unorganized and ill-considered actions of organizations seeking to convey the opinion of the population to the government and the State Duma. So, due to the competition between the five independent initiators of the All-Russian referendum, none of them could register subgroups in 43 regions, which is a condition for holding a referendum in the Russian Federation. By proposing various questions for the referendum, the initiators were unable to unite around one. However, a number of experts suggest that many initiators were created to block the referendum (Khamraev et al., 2018). At the same time, it is worth noting the general rigidity of the established requirements in the Russian Federation for the initiation of a referendum and too short a time before signing the bill.

Thus, with regard to the federal authorities, one can state that they are not ready for dialogue with the population and that their opinion about raising the retirement age is extremely weak - rather, the required perception of the reform was artificially shaped.

**Readiness accounting by regional authorities**

Then it was examined what factors influenced the support of the pension reform by the representative and executive authorities of the regions of the Russian Federation. For this, data from the St. Petersburg Policy Foundation on the public reaction of regional authorities to raising the retirement age and expert assessments of the level of public solidarization, as well as the statistical databases of the Federal State Statistics Service
of the Russian Federation, were used. The author calculated the correlation coefficients between the level of public solidarity with the proposed changes in the pension legislation and the factors potentially influencing this (Table 1).

Table 1. Relationship between pension reform support by regional authorities and territory characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential factors</th>
<th>Pearson's correlation coefficient between the potential factor and the level of public solidarization</th>
<th>A high correlation value and a direct correlation would indicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>representative power/ executive power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparations for the elections in September 2018</td>
<td>0,33/0,40</td>
<td>lack of targeted formation of loyal voter attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Direct elections (for representative power - deputies of the regional parliament, for executive power - the head of the region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Indirect elections*</td>
<td>0,75/ -</td>
<td>absence of purposeful formation of loyal relations of the President and the Parliament of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The demographic situation in the region - in relation to the</td>
<td>0,22/0,08</td>
<td>objective need to raise the retirement age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population over the age of working age **</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>0,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average population growth rate, 2012-2018 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population share, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy, number of years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0,06</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment over working age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate, %</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>0,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average job search time, months</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>0,05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indirect elections were made only for the heads of regions.

** Men over the age of 60 and women over 55 were considered as the population over working age.

*** The average growth rate of the share of the population older than the able-bodied in the Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol was calculated for 2015-2018.

No data for the Republic of Adygea.

Source: calculated by the author based on: (St. Petersburg policy Foundation, 2018); (Federal State Statistics Service, 2018).
All factors are divided into three blocks: preparation for elections in September 2018, the demographic situation in the region and employment of the older population. Most of the factors have a very weak or weak connection with the level of support of representatives of the regional government for pension reform. Weak feedback with the level of employment of the older population can be explained by the understanding of the difficult financial situation of pensioners: they no longer have enough money, they have to continue working, respectively, depriving them of additional income is highly undesirable.

A more significant relationship exists between the level of public solidarity of representative power and:
- preparation for direct elections (feedback is moderate),
- preparation for indirect elections of the head (high feedback),
- proportion of older population (direct direct communication).

Thus, the actions of regional authorities were more dependent on the availability of elections, the need to form a loyal attitude of citizens or deputies of the regional parliament. In regions where elections were not held, the opinion of the population was extremely weak.

We will confirm this by the example of a separate subject of the Russian Federation - the Republic of Karelia. The level of public solidarity with the pension reform of the representative power of the region was 5 points (maximum mark), the executive power - 3 (St. Petersburg policy Foundation, 2018).

At the same time, a survey of older people in the Republic of Karelia showed that they did not support raising the retirement age. Only 34.0% of pensioners work in the region, and 47.6% do not want to continue working because of other life priorities (family, hobby, etc.), lack of health, or psychological readiness. Thus, the questioning of pensioners allowed us to identify both objective and subjective factors of negative perception of pension reform.

At the same time, according to the survey, quite a significant group of pensioners (18.5%) has a desire to find a job, but either cannot find a job (10.2%) or does not seek it. In the
first case, the main obstacle to hiring is the lack of knowledge of modern information technologies and high salary expectations. The termination of a job search is due to a discriminatory attitude towards pensioners, and sometimes their erroneous confidence in such an attitude, low confidence in employment services.

Accordingly, part of the problems of the labor market in an aging population can be solved not only by limiting the right to receive an old-age pension, but also by creating institutional and organizational opportunities for work (Karginova-Gubinova, Romashkina & Prokopiev, 2019).

Conclusions

Based on the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Restriction of the rights of citizens is one of the measures to ensure the national and, in particular, the economic security of the territory. Earlier studies have shown that the main factors determining the willingness of citizens to limit their rights are confidence in the government, political views and the level of risk assessed.

2. Consent to a later acquisition of the right to an old-age insurance pension is primarily associated with an increase in life expectancy, however, due to the availability of the possibility to receive compound interest on a lifetime employment income, this relationship is not linear.

3. The readiness of a significant proportion (almost 60%) of the population of the Russian Federation to limit civil rights does not extend to the right to receive an old-age insurance pension (as of September 2018, only about 10% of citizens agree). The reason for this can be called the emotional neutrality of demographic aging for the population (lack of fear, anger) and, more importantly, the lack of experience with the consequences of such threats. As it is known, direct confrontation with the negative consequences of risk increases its individual significance (Koshiba & Ohtani, 2015).

Therefore, from the point of view of the author, prior to the initiation of the bill on pension reform, it was necessary to massively highlight the features of the demographic processes taking place in the country and the detailed need to raise the retirement age. This would
allow the population to more objectively assess the existing threat and form a more favorable attitude towards pension reform.

At the same time, it should be noted that the bill itself could have been better worked. The necessary employment institutions for pensioners and the improvement of the quality of their labor potential were required to be created not after, but before the initiation of the reform. In addition, it was worthwhile to take into account the experience of European countries, where the retirement age rises by three to six months a year (Obukhova, Pahunov & Ivanter, 2018) - this would be more acceptable to the population.

4. Both federal and regional authorities poorly took into account the readiness of citizens to limit the right to receive an old-age insurance pension. Rather, the federal authorities sought to form a favorable attitude towards reform, using a strategy of assignment, the media, etc. Representatives of regional authorities supported the protests of the population only to achieve loyal relations of citizens or deputies of the regional parliament.

5. Restricting the right to an old-age insurance pension allows you to accurately predict the increase in the labor force involved in the economy, but at the same time it can lead to a decrease in the health of the older population, an increase in the marriage in production, etc. Accordingly, the combination of soft and hard forces is becoming relevant - the formation of a “smart security” model of the territory.

Conducting a survey of retirees at the level of the entire Russian Federation would allow for a competent policy to increase the favorable perception of pension reform. With regard to the Republic of Karelia, it was shown that it is necessary to strengthen the level of health of older persons, raise the status of a veteran, index pension for working pensioners, encourage their involvement in work, protect against age discrimination, etc. It is important to pay special attention to retirees who are not working, but who want to work. For their employment requires the introduction of continuous training in production, specialized courses at employment centers and departure of their specialists in the areas,
the formation of a correct understanding of the labor market, etc. (Karginova-Gubinova, 2018).

Taking into account public perception of existing risks and their readiness for the proposed security measures, including restriction of rights, should form the basis of the economic security policy of individual territories.
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