

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING IDEAS AND IDEOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN SOCIETY

Khodjayev Olimkhon Shavkatovich

Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies,
Kokand State University; Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy

ABSTRACT

This article examines the theoretical foundations for developing ideas and ideological processes in society from philosophical, sociological, political-communicative and axiological perspectives. The central thesis is that an idea should not be reduced to a private opinion, slogan or temporary political formula; rather, it functions as a complex spiritual-practical system that organizes social consciousness, directs collective cooperation, connects historical memory with future-oriented imagination, and gives normative meaning to public life. The article interprets the genesis, stabilization, legitimation and transformation of ideological processes through the theoretical contributions of Plato, Aristotle, Ibn Khaldun, Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Karl Mannheim, Louis Althusser, Jurgen Habermas, Peter Berger, Thomas Luckmann, Clifford Geertz, Manuel Castells and Teun A. van Dijk. It also includes the constitutional and legal foundations of Uzbekistan, development strategies, freedom of conscience, secularism, civil society, information culture and spiritual development as analytical reference points. The study proposes an integrative model in which knowledge, value, communication, institution, digital environment, social responsibility and critical thinking are interpreted as interdependent mechanisms of ideological development.

Keywords: Idea, ideology, social consciousness, communicative rationality, legitimacy, national value, civil society, secularism, information culture, spiritual development.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of developing ideas and ideological processes in society belongs to the most sensitive and, at the same time, the most necessary fields of philosophical inquiry, because no society can exist merely as a mechanical collection of individuals, institutions, economic exchanges and administrative procedures; society becomes a society only when its members recognize common meanings, accept certain symbolic horizons, debate the value of the future, and translate abstract ideals into practical norms of coexistence. In this sense, an idea is not simply a mental image or a verbal formula produced by an individual mind; it is a socially mediated orientation that allows human communities to distinguish between order and chaos, justice and arbitrariness, dignity and humiliation, solidarity and fragmentation, development and stagnation. Ideology, in turn, should not be interpreted only in the narrow negative sense of manipulation, false consciousness or political propaganda, although these distortions certainly exist and must be critically examined. In a broader scientific meaning, ideology is a system of ideas, values, symbols, narratives and institutional practices through which a community interprets itself, legitimizes its social order, mobilizes citizens, educates generations and responds to historical challenges. Theoretical analysis of ideological processes is especially relevant under conditions of globalization, digital communication, accelerated

cultural change and information competition, because the sphere in which social meaning is formed has become more open, fragmented and technologically mediated than ever before. The constitutional principles of freedom of thought, speech, conviction and conscience, together with the idea of a democratic, legal, social and secular state, form the normative basis for a modern understanding of ideological development in Uzbekistan. At the same time, the New Uzbekistan Development Strategy for 2022-2026 and the Uzbekistan-2030 Strategy emphasize human dignity, civil society, rule of law, human capital, spiritual development, education, security and stability as mutually connected directions of national modernization. This means that the development of ideological processes cannot be reduced to a campaign of persuasion or to the repetition of ready-made statements; it requires a deep theoretical platform capable of harmonizing national identity with universal values, historical memory with innovation, state policy with public participation, and spiritual continuity with critical thinking. The topic is also philosophically significant because ideas possess a dual nature: they are born in human consciousness, yet they become socially powerful only through language, education, institutions, rituals, media, law, art and everyday communication. Plato's theory of forms treated ideas as the highest structure of intelligible reality, whereas Aristotle linked political life with the ethical cultivation of citizens and with the pursuit of the common good. Ibn Khaldun, by analyzing *asabiyyah*, demonstrated that social solidarity and group consciousness are decisive factors in the rise and decline of political communities. Modern theories from Marx to Gramsci, Mannheim, Althusser and Habermas revealed that ideas are inseparable from power, class interests, cultural hegemony, social location, institutional reproduction and communicative. Therefore, the scientific task is not to praise ideology uncritically or to condemn it abstractly, but to determine the conditions under which ideological processes become constructive, humanistic, lawful, pluralistic and development-oriented. The relevance of this article follows precisely from this methodological need: contemporary society requires ideological maturity, not ideological noise; meaningful public dialogue, not informational agitation; value-based unity, not forced uniformity; and responsible freedom, not chaotic relativism. A society that cannot formulate, renew and critically evaluate its guiding ideas risks falling either into value emptiness or into radical dogmatism. The first produces apathy, cynicism and social passivity; the second produces intolerance, exclusion and conflict. Between these extremes lies the theoretically grounded path of ideological development, where ideas are connected with knowledge, values are tested through public reason, and national interests are interpreted within the framework of human dignity, legality, interethnic harmony and freedom of conscience. For Uzbekistan, this question has a special importance because the country combines a rich civilizational heritage, Islamic and secular intellectual traditions, multiethnic social experience, rapid modernization, youth-centered educational reforms and openness to the global information space. The Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations and the more recent Concept concerning freedom of conscience and state policy in the religious sphere are important for understanding how ideological development must be built not on coercion, but on constitutional guarantees, respect for diversity and the secular organization of public institutions. Thus, the aim of the present article is to elaborate the theoretical foundations of developing ideas and ideological processes in society by integrating classical philosophy, modern social theory and the

normative context of contemporary Uzbekistan. The research objectives are: first, to clarify the concepts of idea, ideology and ideological process; second, to identify the structural components of ideological development; third, to show the role of communication, institutions and values in the stabilization of social meanings; fourth, to determine the risks that deform ideology into manipulation or extremism; and fifth, to propose an integrative conceptual model suitable for scholarly analysis and practical public policy. The central hypothesis is that ideological processes develop constructively only when they are grounded in knowledge, legitimized by law and public reason, mediated by open communication, supported by education and culture, protected from coercive dogmatism, and oriented toward the dignity of the person and the common good.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodological basis of the study is interdisciplinary and theoretical-comparative, because the phenomenon of ideas and ideology cannot be adequately explained by one discipline alone: philosophy reveals the ontological and axiological status of ideas; sociology explains the social production and distribution of meanings; political theory studies legitimacy, power and civic mobilization; communication theory analyzes discourse, media and public opinion; religious studies clarifies the relationship between faith, secularism and freedom of conscience; and cultural studies interprets symbols, narratives and collective memory. The research is based on the principle that ideology is neither a purely subjective belief nor a purely objective structure; it is a dynamic relation between consciousness and social reality, between symbolic representation and institutional practice, between value orientation and collective action. Therefore, the study applies several mutually complementary methods. The first is the historical-philosophical method, used to trace the evolution of the concept of idea from classical metaphysics to modern social philosophy. Plato's idealism, Aristotle's practical philosophy, Ibn Khaldun's theory of social cohesion, Marx's critique of ideology, Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Mannheim's sociology of knowledge and Habermas's theory of communicative action are treated not as isolated doctrines, but as stages in the theoretical understanding of how ideas become social forces. The second method is conceptual analysis, which distinguishes the notions of idea, ideology, ideological process, value, narrative, legitimacy, discourse and institution. This distinction is necessary because in public language these terms are often mixed, and such mixing weakens scientific precision. An idea is a meaningful orientation; a value is a normative preference; an ideology is a structured and socially transmitted system of ideas and values; a narrative is the historical or symbolic form through which ideology becomes understandable; legitimacy is the accepted justification of authority and social order; discourse is the communicative field in which meanings are produced; and institution is the relatively stable mechanism through which ideas are reproduced and implemented. The third method is structural-functional analysis, which allows us to identify the functions of ideology in society: cognitive explanation of reality, axiological evaluation, integrative consolidation, mobilizing action, legitimizing institutions, educational socialization, identity formation and protective resistance against destructive influences. However, the article deliberately avoids functionalism in its simplistic form, because ideology can also perform dysfunctional roles when it suppresses criticism, spreads

stereotypes, creates enemy images or transforms social diversity into conflict. The fourth method is normative analysis, grounded in constitutional principles and strategic documents of Uzbekistan. The Constitution guarantees freedom of thought, speech, convictions and conscience, recognizes the right to seek and disseminate information, and defines Uzbekistan as a democratic, legal, social and secular state. These principles provide the normative boundary of any constructive ideological process: ideology may educate, inspire and consolidate, but it must not cancel freedom, pluralism, conscience or human dignity. The Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026 identifies the elevation of human dignity, civil society, rule of law, fair social policy, human capital and spiritual development as priority directions, while the Uzbekistan-2030 Strategy connects prosperity, education, spiritual maturity, justice, security and stability into a long-term national development horizon. These documents are used not as political decoration, but as empirical-normative materials that show the institutional context within which ideas operate. The fifth method is discourse analysis, influenced by Habermas and van Dijk, which considers how ideological meanings are formed through language, argument, media framing, educational terminology, digital narratives and everyday communicative practices. This method is particularly important in the contemporary digital environment, where algorithms, social networks, short videos, memes and emotionally charged messages can accelerate the circulation of ideas faster than traditional educational institutions can evaluate them. The sixth method is axiological synthesis, which examines how national values, universal human rights, secular public order, religious tolerance, interethnic harmony, patriotism, social responsibility and critical thinking can be theoretically harmonized. The article does not treat values as static museum objects; values live only when they are interpreted, taught, practiced and renewed through social experience. Finally, the study uses a model-building method: based on the analysis of theoretical literature and normative sources, it constructs an integrative model of ideological development consisting of seven interconnected components: epistemic content, value orientation, communicative mediation, institutional support, cultural memory, digital resilience and reflexive criticism. The reliability of this theoretical model is not measured by statistical experiment, because the article is not an empirical survey; rather, its validity is based on conceptual coherence, explanatory power, compatibility with recognized theories and relevance to contemporary social conditions. Such methodology corresponds to the requirements of high-level theoretical research, where the scholar is expected not merely to repeat known definitions, but to synthesize them into a new interpretive framework. In this sense, the article proceeds from the thesis that an ideological process develops constructively when its cognitive dimension is supported by knowledge rather than myth, its value dimension is supported by human dignity rather than exclusion, its communicative dimension is supported by dialogue rather than command, its institutional dimension is supported by law rather than arbitrariness, its cultural dimension is supported by memory rather than nostalgia, its digital dimension is supported by media literacy rather than manipulation, and its critical dimension is supported by responsible reflection rather than destructive skepticism.

RESULTS

The theoretical analysis produced several major results that clarify the foundations for developing ideas and ideological processes in society. First, the study demonstrates that the concept of idea has a broader structure than is usually assumed in everyday discourse. An idea is not simply a thought that appears in consciousness; it is a meaningful orientation that contains cognitive, normative, emotional and practical elements. Its cognitive element explains what reality is; its normative element proposes what reality should become; its emotional element gives motivation, pride, hope or responsibility; and its practical element pushes individuals and groups toward action. When these elements are separated, the idea loses its social force: knowledge without value becomes cold technocracy, value without knowledge becomes empty moralism, emotion without reason becomes fanaticism, and action without normative reflection becomes opportunism. Second, the research shows that ideology is a structured system of such ideas and values, but its quality depends on the mode of its development. A constructive ideology is open to knowledge, humanistic in value orientation, lawful in institutional expression, dialogical in communication and self-critical in renewal. A destructive ideology, by contrast, is closed to evidence, exclusionary in value orientation, coercive in institutional expression, monological in communication and hostile to criticism. This distinction allows us to avoid two extremes: ideological absolutism, which turns any official idea into unquestionable truth, and ideological nihilism, which assumes that every ideology is necessarily deception. Scientific analysis must recognize that ideology can be both a mechanism of domination and a resource of social integration, depending on how it is formed, legitimized and practiced. Third, the article identifies seven structural components of ideological development. The first component is epistemic content: every socially significant idea must rely on knowledge, historical accuracy, philosophical clarity and scientific reasoning. Without epistemic content, ideology becomes mythological improvisation and is easily captured by conspiracy theories. The second component is value orientation: ideology must express a hierarchy of values, such as human dignity, justice, freedom, solidarity, patriotism, tolerance and responsibility. Without value orientation, society loses moral direction and public institutions become purely technical. The third component is communicative mediation: ideas develop through language, public discussion, education, media, literature, art and digital networks. Without communication, even the most correct idea remains socially inactive. The fourth component is institutional support: schools, universities, civil society organizations, public administration, law, cultural institutions, mass media and family transmit and stabilize ideas. Without institutions, ideological processes become episodic and unstable. The fifth component is cultural memory: no ideology can be sustainable if it breaks completely with history, because people understand the future through inherited symbols, memories, heroes, traumas and achievements. However, memory must not become a prison of the past; it should become a source of responsible renewal. The sixth component is digital resilience: in the twenty-first century, ideological processes are shaped by online platforms, algorithmic visibility, information overload and transnational flows of meaning. A society without digital resilience is vulnerable to manipulation, radicalization, misinformation and emotional polarization. The seventh component is reflexive criticism: ideology must contain mechanisms of self-correction, because any system of ideas becomes

dangerous when it loses the ability to hear questions. Fourth, the study reveals that ideological processes pass through five basic stages: emergence, articulation, diffusion, institutionalization and renewal. Emergence occurs when a social problem, historical challenge or moral need produces a new meaning. Articulation translates this meaning into language, concepts, slogans, programs, scientific interpretations or cultural images. Diffusion spreads the idea through education, media, family, professional communities, religious and cultural spaces, and digital communication. Institutionalization gives the idea stable form in law, policy, curriculum, rituals, administrative practice or civic habits. Renewal is the stage at which ideology is reinterpreted in response to new conditions. If renewal is blocked, ideology becomes dogma; if institutionalization is weak, ideology becomes a temporary mood; if articulation is poor, ideology remains vague; if diffusion is irresponsible, ideology can be distorted; if emergence lacks real social need, ideology appears artificial. Fifth, the study clarifies the special role of freedom and legality in ideological development. In a modern constitutional society, ideological unity cannot mean forced sameness. The Constitution's guarantees of freedom of thought, speech, convictions and conscience establish the legal conditions for a mature public sphere. This means that ideological development should be based on persuasion, education, argument, cultural example and social usefulness, not on coercive imposition. Freedom of conscience is particularly important because the religious sphere is one of the most sensitive areas of identity. The legal framework of Uzbekistan emphasizes that a person may profess any religion or none, and compulsory imposition of religious views is impermissible. Therefore, the development of social ideas must harmonize secular public order with respect for religious diversity and moral traditions. Sixth, the results indicate that national ideology in a modernizing society should be interpreted not as isolation from the world, but as the ability to participate in global civilization while preserving moral independence, cultural dignity and social solidarity. Globalization does not abolish national ideas; it tests their depth. A weak national idea reacts to globalization with fear or imitation; a mature national idea enters global communication with confidence, absorbs useful innovations, rejects destructive influences and translates universal values into national cultural language. Seventh, the study proposes an integrative model of ideological development. At its center stands the human person as bearer of dignity, conscience, reason and social responsibility. Around the person are three primary circles: knowledge, value and communication. Knowledge prevents ideological blindness; value prevents moral emptiness; communication prevents social isolation. These circles are supported by institutions, law, culture and digital literacy. The model's outer horizon is the common good, understood not as an abstract slogan, but as a practical balance of social stability, justice, freedom, development, security and solidarity. Within this model, the role of the state is to create legal, educational and cultural conditions; the role of civil society is to enrich public dialogue and social control; the role of science is to provide conceptual clarity and evidence; the role of education is to form critical and responsible citizens; the role of media is to circulate reliable meanings; and the role of the family and local community is to transmit ethical habits. Eighth, the analysis shows that ideological processes are most productive when they are connected with real social practice. An idea that does not improve education, work ethics, civic responsibility, intergenerational respect, ecological awareness, legal culture or public communication

remains rhetorical. Therefore, theoretical foundations must lead to practical criteria: Does the idea strengthen human dignity? Does it increase social trust? Does it reduce ignorance and manipulation? Does it respect constitutional freedoms? Does it help youth understand their responsibility? Does it contribute to harmony among different groups? Does it develop critical thinking? Does it help society respond to global risks? If the answer is negative, the idea may be loud, but it is not socially constructive. These results confirm the hypothesis that constructive ideological development requires the unity of knowledge, values, communication, institutions, legal guarantees, digital resilience and critical reflection.

DISCUSSION

The obtained results allow a deeper discussion of several theoretical problems that remain central for contemporary philosophy of society. The first problem concerns the relation between ideology and truth. Classical critiques often associated ideology with illusion, especially in Marxist theory, where ideology was linked to false consciousness and the concealment of material relations. This critique remains important because every society produces narratives that may justify inequality, power or privilege. However, if ideology is understood only as deception, we lose the ability to explain how emancipatory, humanistic and developmental ideas also function socially. Gramsci's concept of hegemony is useful here because it shows that social leadership is maintained not only through force, but through consent, culture, education and moral-intellectual direction. Yet the same concept also suggests that a society can build progressive hegemony through ethical leadership, public education and civic participation. Mannheim added another important dimension: ideas are socially situated, meaning that no group thinks from nowhere. This does not make truth impossible; it makes reflexivity necessary. A mature ideological process must understand its own social location, interests and assumptions. Habermas offers a normative solution by linking legitimacy with communicative rationality: social norms become more justified when they can withstand public argument under conditions of openness, equality and reasoned dialogue. For this reason, ideological development must include not only the dissemination of correct ideas, but the cultivation of communicative institutions where citizens can discuss, question and internalize meanings. The second problem concerns the relation between national idea and pluralism. Some approaches assume that ideological unity requires reduction of pluralism, while others fear that pluralism necessarily weakens unity. Both assumptions are insufficient. A strong society is not one in which all people think identically; it is one in which different groups share constitutional loyalty, mutual respect, legal culture and a common developmental horizon while preserving legitimate diversity. Uzbekistan's constitutional model is significant in this regard because it defines the state as democratic, legal, social and secular, while guaranteeing freedom of thought, information and conscience. This creates a theoretical basis for a national idea that does not eliminate diversity but organizes it within a shared civic framework. The secular character of the state should also be interpreted correctly: secularism is not hostility to religion; it is the legal neutrality of public institutions and the protection of freedom of conscience for believers and non-believers alike. In a society with deep religious and cultural traditions, such balance is not merely juridical; it is an ideological necessity, because coercive secularism and coercive religiosity are both

destructive. The third problem concerns the transformation of ideological processes in the digital era. Castells argued that contemporary societies are increasingly structured as networks, where power operates through communication flows and the ability to program or reprogram networks. This means that ideological development today cannot rely only on traditional channels such as textbooks, lectures, official speeches or printed media. Young people encounter ideas through social networks, video platforms, influencers, gaming cultures, transnational communities and algorithmically selected content. Van Dijk's discourse analysis helps to understand how ideology is encoded in language, frames, categories, presuppositions and repeated narratives. In digital communication, these mechanisms become more rapid and often less visible. A short emotional message may influence collective perception more strongly than a long academic explanation. Here the challenge is not simply to censor harmful content, because excessive control can damage trust and freedom; the deeper task is to develop media literacy, critical thinking, ethical digital behavior and reliable public communication. A society that educates citizens to recognize manipulation, verify information, respect difference and argue responsibly is ideologically stronger than a society that only reacts after misinformation spreads. The fourth problem concerns the connection between ideology and social trust. Ideas become socially effective when people believe that institutions embody them. If public discourse speaks of justice while everyday practice produces unfairness, ideology loses legitimacy. If education speaks of critical thinking while classroom practice rewards memorization, the idea becomes decorative. If law declares freedom while public culture punishes sincere questions, ideological development becomes formal. Therefore, the credibility of ideology depends on congruence between declared values and institutional behavior. The New Uzbekistan Development Strategy and Uzbekistan-2030 Strategy provide broad developmental horizons, but their ideological power depends on the extent to which human dignity, rule of law, education, social policy and spiritual development are experienced by citizens in real life. This is a general sociological law: values are trusted when they are practiced. The fifth problem concerns the role of education. Education is not only transmission of knowledge; it is the formation of worldview, moral judgment, communicative competence and civic responsibility. If ideological education becomes mechanical repetition, it produces either superficial conformity or hidden resistance. If it becomes dialogical, evidence-based and connected with real social problems, it develops mature citizens. For this reason, universities and schools should not teach ideology as a closed doctrine, but as a field of responsible thinking about society, history, values, law, identity and the future. Philosophy has a special function here: it teaches the ability to define concepts, compare arguments, identify contradictions, distinguish value from interest, and ask about meaning. In societies undergoing modernization, philosophical education protects ideological processes from both primitive propaganda and imported intellectual dependency. The sixth problem concerns the boundary between patriotism and nationalism. Patriotism, understood as responsible love for one's homeland, readiness to serve the common good and respect for the dignity of fellow citizens, is constructive. Nationalism becomes destructive when it turns identity into superiority, excludes minorities or treats criticism as betrayal. A theoretically grounded national idea must therefore be patriotic without chauvinism, open without imitation, traditional without stagnation, modern without rootlessness, and spiritual without fanaticism. This balance is

difficult but essential. It requires continuous work in education, media, culture, law and public administration. The seventh problem concerns the danger of ideological vacuum. Some may believe that a modern society can live without ideology, relying only on market interests, private preferences and administrative rules. This is an illusion. When constructive ideas are weak, destructive ideas do not politely wait outside the door; they enter through apathy, consumerism, extremism, misinformation, cynicism and radical simplifications. Human beings search for meaning, belonging and future. If society does not provide mature frameworks of meaning, immature frameworks will fill the gap. Thus, the question is not whether ideology will exist, but what quality of ideological process will shape social consciousness. The eighth problem concerns self-criticism. Every ideology needs critique, because critique cleans the window through which society sees itself. Without critique, ideology becomes dogma; without ideology, critique becomes sterile negativity. The mature solution is reflexive ideology: a system of ideas that knows its principles, defends its values, but also corrects its mistakes. This is especially important for DSc-level theoretical analysis, because scientific thought must not serve as an echo of slogans; it must reveal conceptual depth, contradictions, risks and developmental possibilities. The proposed integrative model responds to these problems by placing the human person, knowledge, values, communication, institutions, culture, digital resilience and criticism into one system. Its practical meaning is clear: ideological development should be evaluated not by the intensity of declarations, but by the quality of social consciousness it produces. A constructive ideological process produces citizens who are loyal to the law, respectful of diversity, proud of national heritage, open to knowledge, resistant to manipulation, capable of dialogue and responsible for the future. A destructive ideological process produces fear, passivity, intolerance, distrust, imitation or aggression. Therefore, the theoretical foundation of ideological development is ultimately ethical: the measure of every idea is its contribution to the dignity and development of the human being within a just and stable society.

CONCLUSION

The conducted theoretical research confirms that ideas and ideological processes are fundamental mechanisms through which society organizes meaning, legitimizes institutions, educates citizens, preserves continuity and projects its future. The development of ideas is not a secondary cultural activity that can be left to spontaneous opinion; it is a strategic sphere of social existence, because every reform, law, educational program, cultural policy and civic initiative presupposes a certain image of the human being, society, justice, responsibility and development. The article has shown that the concept of idea must be understood as a cognitive-normative-practical orientation, while ideology should be interpreted as a structured system of socially transmitted meanings that may become either constructive or destructive depending on its relation to knowledge, freedom, law, communication, institutions and values. The research clarified that constructive ideological processes require seven interconnected foundations: epistemic content, value orientation, communicative mediation, institutional support, cultural memory, digital resilience and reflexive criticism. These components are not optional additions; they are conditions of ideological maturity. Knowledge protects society from myth and manipulation; values protect it from moral emptiness; communication protects

it from isolation and command-style thinking; institutions protect ideas from instability; cultural memory protects development from rootlessness; digital resilience protects public consciousness from informational aggression; and criticism protects ideology from dogmatism. The study also demonstrated that the constitutional and strategic context of contemporary Uzbekistan creates a normative framework for mature ideological development. Freedom of thought, speech, conviction and conscience, the principles of a democratic, legal, social and secular state, the emphasis on human dignity, civil society, rule of law, education, human capital, spiritual development, security and stability all indicate that ideological processes should be oriented toward responsible freedom and social harmony rather than coercive uniformity. The theoretical importance of the article lies in its attempt to integrate classical philosophy, modern social theory and national developmental priorities into a single conceptual model. The practical importance lies in the possibility of applying this model to education, public communication, cultural policy, youth work, religious studies, media literacy and civil society development. From this perspective, ideological development should not be measured by the number of repeated formulas, but by the quality of citizens it forms: intellectually honest, morally responsible, legally conscious, culturally rooted, digitally literate, dialogically competent and socially active. The main recommendation is that universities, research institutions, public organizations and educational systems should treat ideology not as a closed doctrine, but as an open, knowledge-based and value-oriented field of social responsibility. Curricula should strengthen philosophical thinking, history of ideas, media literacy, civic ethics and comparative analysis of social theories. Public communication should prefer argument over emotional pressure, explanation over slogan, evidence over rumor and dialogue over monologue. State and civil society institutions should ensure that declared values are embodied in practical behavior, because the legitimacy of any ideology depends on the visible consistency between word and deed. Religious and secular discourses should be harmonized through respect for freedom of conscience, legal neutrality of public institutions and recognition of the moral role of culture and tradition. Digital ideological security should be developed primarily through education, critical thinking and reliable communication, not merely through reactive restrictions. Finally, every national idea must remain open to renewal, because society changes, generations change, technologies change and global challenges change; only a self-renewing idea can preserve continuity without becoming obsolete. The general conclusion is that the theoretical foundations of developing ideas and ideological processes in society consist in the humanistic unity of truth, value, law, dialogue, memory, institution and responsibility. When this unity exists, ideology becomes a source of social development; when it is broken, ideology turns into noise, manipulation or conflict. Therefore, the highest task of modern philosophical science is to cultivate an ideological culture in which social unity is achieved not through fear, but through consciousness; not through coercion, but through conviction; not through isolation, but through dialogue; and not through empty rhetoric, but through the practical elevation of human dignity and the common good.

REFERENCES

1. Ходжаев, Олимхон Шавкатович. "Индивидуальный подход в педагогическом процессе: основные положения и понятия." **СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ КОНЦЕПЦИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМАХ**. 2016.
2. Xodjayev O. S. IJTIMOIY ONG STRUKTURASIDA G 'OYA VA MAFKURANING TUTGAN O 'RNI //Oriental Art and Culture. – 2025. – Т. 6. – №. 4. – С. 201-207.
3. Shavkatovich, Hodjayev Olimkhon. "THE NEED FOR INTENSIFICATION OF IDEOLOGICAL PROCESSES." *Евразийский Союз Ученых* 4-9 (73) (2020): 63-64.
4. Ходжаев, Олимхон Шавкатович. "К ВОПРОСУ О ПОНИМАНИИ СООТНОШЕНИЯ, СОДЕРЖАНИЯ И НАПРАВЛЕННОСТИ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО РАЗВИТИЯ СОЦИОЛОГИИ." **СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ КОНЦЕПЦИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМАХ**. 2016.
5. Ходжаев, О. Ш. "Социально-психологические аспекты специфики общения в Интернете." *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее*. 2016.
6. Ходжаев, О. Ш. "Организация самостоятельной работы по социологии." *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее*. 2016.
7. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. New edition adopted by national referendum on 30 April 2023.
8. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-60. On the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026. 28 January 2022.
9. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-158. On the Strategy "Uzbekistan-2030". 11 September 2023.
10. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ZRU-699. On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations. 5 July 2021.
11. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ZRU-1037. On Approval of the Concept of Ensuring Freedom of Conscience of Citizens and State Policy in the Religious Sphere in the Republic of Uzbekistan. 25 February 2025.
12. Eagleton, T. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
13. Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1992.
14. Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1998.
15. Ibn Khaldun. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated by F. Rosenthal. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.
16. Marx, K., Engels, F. *The German Ideology*. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1998.
17. Gramsci, A. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.