ISSUES OF COMBATING IDEOLOGICAL SECURITY THREATS

Salaeva Laylo Shavkatovna

Senior Lecturer at the Institute for Retraining and Professional
Development of Specialists in Physical Culture and Sports under the
Uzbekistan State Academy of Physical Culture and Sports

In the modern world, the intensification of globalization, information warfare, and digital transformation has made ideological security a pressing geopolitical issue. Hybrid conflicts, manipulation based on artificial intelligence, and ideological pressures through mass culture are being used as strategic tools to weaken national consciousness. For this reason, the issue of ideological security is increasingly being reinterpreted not as a military-political defense, but as a means of controlling social consciousness.

The rapid development of globalization, digital transformation, and communication tools has greatly expanded the scope of ideological influence on human consciousness. Consequently, in contemporary society, ideological security has become a socio-philosophical and political necessity that must be addressed not merely at the individual level but through institutional protection mechanisms. At the same time, ensuring this security is increasingly carried out not only through force-based systems but also through social institutions, humanitarian frameworks, and civil society actors.

In the modern world, ensuring ideological security has become one of the central directions of state policy. Under conditions of globalization, digital communication, and ideological pluralism, tools for influencing and controlling human consciousness have become complex and multi-layered. Therefore, guaranteeing ideological security through social institutions—especially state institutions—has become an urgent socio-philosophical requirement. State institutions act not only as political management entities but also as moral and ethical structures shaping the ideological environment [1].

From a socio-philosophical perspective, state institutions are not merely organizational-administrative systems; they are social structures that govern society based on a specific ideological paradigm, shape normative consciousness, and control the information space. As Pierre Bourdieu emphasized, institutions exercise "symbolic power" by controlling the "fields of discourse" in society. Hence, in ensuring ideological security, the role of state institutions is decisive not only legally but also semantically, communicatively, and ethically.

In Uzbekistan, the activity of state institutions in this area has become a key component of national policy strategy. For example, the Spirituality and Enlightenment Center under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Youth Affairs Agency of Uzbekistan, the "Yuksalish" National Movement, the National Institute for Ideology and Thought, social-

cultural projects within the MTRK system, and other structures operate directly to ensure ideological stability [2].

The Spirituality and Enlightenment Center occupies a central role in promoting healthy social consciousness, forming ideological immunity based on national values, and conducting conscious resistance against alien ideas among youth. Through its activities, ideological and moral education is carried out across all state bodies, educational institutions, and cultural and information centers. In this regard, the Center functions as a continuous educational tool for ensuring ideological security.

The National Institute for Ideology and Thought is engaged in analyzing ideological threats, developing conceptual frameworks, producing analytical materials, and renewing ideological discourse. Its work is theoretically significant, as it allows the creation of scientifically grounded "counter-narratives" through the analysis of various ideas and ideologies. Methodological materials and textbooks prepared by the Institute form the epistemic foundation of state-level ideological policy [3].

Practically, state institutions ensure ideological security through three main stages:

Identification Stage – At this stage, negative, harmful, or destructive content in the information flow is identified. Algorithmic analysis systems, developed in cooperation with the Ministry for the Development of Information Technologies and Communications of Uzbekistan and the State Security Service, serve as key tools.

Prevention Stage – At this stage, to prevent the spread of harmful ideas, continuous ideological and educational programs, awareness campaigns, and intellectual projects are implemented through state institutions.

Rehabilitation Stage – At this stage, mechanisms are established to work with individuals at risk, particularly youth, providing them with psychological and moral support. For example, projects conducted by the Youth Affairs Agency, such as "Youth Registry," "Imkon," and "My Idea," directly contribute to the consolidation of youth consciousness [4].

Such systematic approaches have been validated by international experience. Examples include the Global Engagement Center in the United States, Roskomnadzor in Russia, and the Internet Ideology Department in China. These are real models of ensuring ideological security through state institutions. Specifically, since 2016, the U.S. GEC has developed "counter-narratives" against foreign non-traditional propaganda channels and implements state-funded ideological protection strategies on social networks. Uzbekistan has adopted a similar approach, developing its own network of institutional mechanisms to safeguard ideological security.

At the same time, another important institution in ensuring ideological security is the education system. Through state education policies, incorporating components such as "spirituality," "moral education," and "cultural identity" into curricula plays a strategic role in shaping

ideological immunity. The Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan dated February 18, 2021, "On Measures to Strengthen the Spiritual and Ideological Immunity of Youth" serves as an institutional basis in this regard [5].

From a philosophical perspective, state institutions are symbolic and practical tools that establish a "healthy ideological space." As Michel Foucault emphasized, every institution operates within a "network of knowledge-power relations" between authority and consciousness. Therefore, ideological security is not only about control but also about consciously shaping social consciousness and creating an ideological context that aligns with social needs.

In conclusion, the role and mechanisms of state institutions in ideological security are not limited to political control. They serve as conceptual and practical instruments for ensuring ideological stability, forming moral immunity, and protecting society from global threats. Such an approach is particularly relevant for countries undergoing transformational processes, like Uzbekistan. We can conclude that in states with weak institutional foundations for ideological security, societies are vulnerable to instability, cultural fragility, and susceptibility to external ideas [6].

The ideological consequences of globalization affect not only political systems but also the entire societal structure. Consequently, approaches to ensuring ideological security are expanding: it is increasingly necessary to implement this process not only through state institutions but also through civil society actors. This approach develops at the intersection of social philosophy and modern humanitarian approaches. Civil society is considered one of the most important factors in modern society for maintaining social control, ethical norms, and information balance.

Among special strategies, normative frameworks, and institutional mechanisms, civil society institutions play a key role in transforming social consciousness, ensuring ideological stability, and shaping a conscious civic position. From a social-philosophical perspective, civil society consists of independently formed, relatively autonomous entities that hold social responsibility. As Antonio Gramsci put it, civil society is the "main arena of ideological production," which, unlike the political state, ensures social stability by gaining citizen consent. Therefore, in ensuring ideological security, civil society should be seen not as a passive audience but as an active actor. In modern society, these actors play a decisive role in shaping moral and ethical standards, religious perspectives, critical approaches to information flows, and ideological immunity [7].

In the case of Uzbekistan, significant reforms have been implemented in recent years to expand civil society. For example, the Law "On Supporting and Developing Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organizations," adopted on June 4, 2021, as well as initiatives such as the "Yuksalish" National Movement, the "Great Future" Expert Council, the Youth Affairs Agency, local

social media platforms, religious institutions, and non-state educational institutions, aim to enhance social activity, ideological immunity, and moral resilience of the population.

The practical actions of civil society institutions in ensuring ideological security are becoming increasingly systematized. The main practical directions of this process include:

Programs for Moral Education and Awareness-Raising — First and foremost, in shaping social consciousness, traditional and local institutions, such as the mahalla (neighborhood) and family systems, play a critical role. Through these institutions, value-based discussions, roundtable conversations, and cultural-educational events are organized for youth and the middle generation. This approach aligns with Shils' concept of the "moral center," in which social institutions cultivate a sense of responsibility toward society in citizens through ethical norms.

Shaping Civic Engagement on Digital Platforms. In the modern world, the formation of social consciousness occurs not only in the physical environment but also in the digital space. Therefore, the second practical direction is to develop civic awareness through digital information networks. By creating and distributing socially-oriented content via bloggers, vloggers, and social media platforms, "information immunity" is cultivated. In this regard, the "Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy highlights digital communication and spiritual stability as a separate block. According to Manuel Castells, digital networks create a "new ideological space" for the transformation of social consciousness [8].

Social Monitoring and Barometers. The third direction focuses on assessing the dynamics of the information environment to maintain ideological balance. Civil society institutions carry out continuous monitoring of societal moods, ideological risk zones, and trends in the information space. Social-psychological indicators, content analysis methods, and public surveys are used to provide practical recommendations to the government.

The practical directions outlined above not only constitute external activities but also reveal the deeper internal capabilities of civil society in ensuring ideological security. Our position is that civil society institutions play an invaluable role not only in forming immunity against information threats but also in enhancing citizens' information literacy, their ability to consciously select and evaluate information. As Yuval Noah Harari emphasizes, "in the digital age, the struggle to control human consciousness is carried out through moral and technological means".

In this process, local communities (mahallas), schools, universities, religious organizations, and even social media users become active participants on the ideological front. This aligns with the concept of "distributed agency," where each social actor participates in shaping ideological security within their own informational context [9].

The relevance of this issue is recognized not only nationally but also globally. Several international experiences can be analyzed in this regard. For example, in South Korea, the

"Digital Ethics Community" project has implemented extensive programs to increase the responsibility of parents, teachers, and students regarding digital information. These projects are based on Howard Rheingold's concepts of "digital literacy" and "information citizenship."

In Germany, the Federal Agency for Civic Education conducts media literacy courses, anti-populism trainings, and communication models based on the theory of "ideological hygiene." This model, drawing on Niklas Luhmann's social systems theory, conceptualizes society as a self-regulating system adapting to the flow of information.

Based on the national practices and international experiences analyzed above, we propose the following measures, which aim to transform civil society institutions into active actors of ideological security:

Establish non-governmental monitoring centers, such as "Media Watch," to enhance civil society's role in information security;

Develop "ideological resilience" courses in schools and universities in collaboration with NGOs;

Organize training sessions and discussion clubs on "information hygiene" in local communities (mahallas);

Implement "digital immunity" training programs for active bloggers and leaders on social media [10].

In conclusion, considering the arguments above, ideological security today is not only a matter of political or social protection but also the cultivation of social culture, conscious citizenship, and responsible approaches to information. In addressing this issue at the institutional level, civil society plays a decisive role. The interconnection between ideological security, social consciousness, and civic culture becomes increasingly critical, especially in the digital age. Therefore, each civil society institution acts as an "internal fortress" of ideological security.

For modern societies, ideological security is not merely about political stability or regulating information flows; it is primarily a systematic process that ensures conscious citizenship, ideological resilience, and social unity. From this perspective, civil society institutions emerge as direct participants in ensuring ideological security, shaping information literacy, and developing conceptual approaches.

However, to assess the role and effectiveness of these actors, it is necessary to use socio-philosophical criteria and practical-methodological approaches. Such approaches are particularly important in the context of modern social transformations, the dynamics of the information environment, and the ideological struggles within society. Philosophical analysis of various states' approaches to ideological security allows the development of strategies that take into account the unique socio-historical context of each society. For example:

In the United States, the Global Engagement Center develops counter-narratives against foreign disinformation. This approach, grounded in the principle of "freedom of information" in liberal societies, is based on strategic diplomacy.

The Russian model is implemented through centralized state control via Roskomnadzor and is based on the ideology of "information sovereignty." This model resembles an authoritarian version of Luhmann's theory of "self-regulating systems."

In China, ideological control is integrated into every node of the internet, forming a technocratic system that ensures ideological stability based on "Xi Jinping Thought." In this approach, the internet is considered not merely as a medium for information but as a tool for managing consciousness [11].

A common feature of these models is the aim to achieve social stability through ideological control of the information environment. However, their philosophical foundations and practical methods differ significantly.

Unlike the approaches analyzed above, the Uzbek model seeks to ensure social stability through ideological integration based on values, historical consciousness, and civic culture. Within social philosophy, this approach is interpreted as an "ontological approach" – that is, rather than imposing external control, society is given the capacity to act consciously based on its internal identity and values. In the "Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy, ideological security is considered alongside information policy. Civil society institutions—including NGOs, bloggers, public councils, and educational institutions—are designated as the main actors shaping ideological immunity. The role of civil society here is not only organizational but also moral, communicative, and educational, enabling the social system to remain modern, open, and ideologically resilient [12].

From a philosophical perspective, evaluating ideological security based on criteria and methods means understanding which ideas are becoming dominant, who promotes them, and through which institutional mechanisms they are being implemented. Monitoring, counter-narratives, analysis of international models, and nationally-specific strategies demonstrate that civil society is not merely proactive but also a consciously engaged force in ideological processes. Therefore, the ideological security system is not merely technical control but a set of moral, ideological, and communicative mechanisms that preserve social consciousness.

REFERENCES:

1. Bourdieu, P. Sociology of Politics. – Moscow: Societas, 1990.
2. Castells M. The Rise of the Network Society. – 2nd ed. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2010.
3. Cohen J., Arato A. Civil Society and Political Theory. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

4. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated February 18, 2021, "On Measures to Strengthen the Spiritual and Ideological Immunity of Youth." – URL: https://lex.uz/docs/5308189

5. Emirbayer M., Mische A. What Is Agency? // American Journal of Sociology. – 1998. – Vol. 103, No. 4. – b. 962–1023.

6. Foucault, M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. – St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1997.

7. Global Engagement Center (GEC) – U.S. Department of State. – URL: https://www.state.gov/bureaus-offices/under-secretary-for-public-diplomacy-and-public-affairs/global-engagement-center

8. Gramsci A. Selections from the prison notebooks //The applied theatre reader. – Routledge, 2020. – b. 141-142.

9. Habermas, J. The Theory of Communicative Action. – Boston: Beacon Press, 1987. – Vol. 2.

10. Harari Y. N. 21 Lessons for the 21st Century. – London: Jonathan Cape, 2019.

11. Krippendorff K. Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology. – 3rd ed. – Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2013.

12. Leonardi R., Nanetti R. Y., Putnam R. D. Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy. – Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton university press, 2001. –b. 89.

13. Luhmann N. Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1995.

14. Nazarov, K.N. Philosophical and Methodological Foundations of Ideological Security. – Tashkent: Fan, 2022. – 260 p.

15. Rheingold H. Net Smart: How to Thrive Online. – Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012.

16. Roskomnadzor – Federal Service for Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Media. – URL: https://rkn.gov.ru

17. Shils E. Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

18. Taylor C. A Secular Age. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.