



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN ENSURING IDEOLOGICAL SECURITY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Salaeva Laylo Shavkatovna

Senior Lecturer, Institute for Retraining and Advanced Training
of Specialists in Physical Education and Sports under the
Uzbekistan State Academy of Sports Sciences

Abstract

In the context of globalization processes and the digital revolution, the issue of ideological security has become one of the fundamental factors determining the internal stability, sovereignty, and development strategy of every state. The crossing of information flows beyond national borders, the rapid and unrestricted nature of digital communication, and the increasingly complex character of hybrid ideological threats necessitate a radical rethinking of approaches to ideological security.

In the modern geopolitical environment, the concept of ideological security has become one of the most complex, multi-layered, and theoretically and practically grounded components of national security systems. In particular, for global power centers such as the United States and the European Union, which strive to maintain ideological leadership in the global political landscape, ideological security serves not only as a defensive mechanism but also as an essential tool for strengthening political legitimacy, social stability, and cultural identity. These states implement such processes not only through internal policies but also through diplomatic, informational, educational, and technological strategies. Therefore, analyzing their approaches to ideological security allows for a deeper



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

understanding of the nature of ideological competition in the global information space.

The conceptual approach of the United States to ideological security primarily reflects its geopolitical identity as a global exporter of liberal-democratic values. This approach aligns with Fukuyama's concept of the "end of history," in which liberal democracy is considered the final form of ideological evolution. U.S. foreign policy is closely linked to the dissemination of ideas such as democracy, human rights, freedom of speech, and market economy. These ideological initiatives, based on the concept of "American exceptionalism," stem from a political and cultural position aimed at establishing itself as a global leader. In this regard, this model serves to establish ideological superiority as the foundation of international order and political legitimacy.

The United States implements this strategy through the concept of "soft power," which relies on influencing global consciousness without the use of force. Through attractive culture, technological innovations, world-renowned educational institutions, and international grant systems, it maintains ideological dominance in the global arena. From this perspective, ideological security is interpreted not only as an external defense mechanism but also as a necessity for internal ideological resilience and social stability.

Mass culture is one of the most influential tools of this dominance. Hollywood productions, Netflix, YouTube, Apple Music, and similar platforms disseminate American lifestyles, liberal values, and individualistic ideals globally. Through such content, cognitive acceptance of certain moral and political models is formed in human consciousness. This phenomenon can be analyzed within Gramsci's concept of "cultural hegemony," which explains the dominance of ideas through their perception as "normal," "universal," or "natural." As a result,



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

ideological influence becomes a form of “victory without weapons,” where cultural impact serves as a tool of ideological security.

The cognitive power of such influence lies in its ability to present itself as attractive rather than coercive. This enables ideological dominance through voluntary acceptance rather than force. This model demonstrates that in modern ideological security policy, control over consciousness is achieved through indirect rather than direct means.

Control over information flows is also an integral component of U.S. ideological security. After it was proven that foreign disinformation campaigns influenced public opinion during the 2016 U.S. presidential elections, the Global Engagement Center (GEC) was established. GEC is responsible for identifying foreign ideological influence, analyzing information flows using artificial intelligence, and developing counter-strategies. This demonstrates that ideological security is increasingly viewed not only as ideological but also as algorithmic governance.

In addition, DARPA projects funded by the Pentagon and other strategic institutions promote the use of artificial intelligence to detect informational threats and ideological risks. This approach elevates ideological security to the level of real-time monitoring of cognitive threats in digital platforms, thereby creating an interconnection between consciousness, information, and algorithms. The European Union, in contrast, develops its ideological security strategy based on different principles. Its approach emphasizes internal stability, civil liberties, tolerance, and social cohesion. The EU interprets its core values—human rights, rule of law, cultural diversity, and social inclusiveness—as the foundation of ideological security. Therefore, this model functions not as authoritarian control but as a mechanism for maintaining stability in public consciousness.



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

The EU prioritizes media literacy, critical thinking, and social cohesion as key mechanisms of ideological security. Within the framework of the Digital Education Action Plan (2021–2027), efforts are made to develop information immunity among youth against fake news, extremist content, and algorithmic manipulation. Such preventive measures strengthen ideological security through internal cognitive and moral resources of society.

Europe’s multicultural structure and migration dynamics place integration policy at the center of ideological security strategies. Policies aimed at cultural integration and civic inclusion are developed to prevent extremism, marginalization, and radicalization. The Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) operates as a multi-sectoral platform in this regard. This approach demonstrates the effectiveness of influencing ideological security through socio-psychological environments rather than direct control over public consciousness. The European Union also acts as a defender of its values in foreign policy. It promotes democracy, human rights, gender equality, green policy, and the rule of law through international agreements and diplomatic strategies. This indicates that the EU’s ideological security strategy is closely integrated with international diplomacy, thereby strengthening ideological influence both internally and externally.

A philosophical-theoretical analysis of the strategies of the United States and the European Union shows that they rely not on force but on cognitive and cultural influence to ensure ideological security. In this sense, they are closely aligned with Antonio Gramsci’s theory of “consent-based domination,” where legitimacy is achieved through control of consciousness rather than coercion. In modern ideological security theory, this model of “governing consciousness through consent” has become dominant.



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

In conclusion, the ideological security strategies of the United States and the European Union constitute complex systems that integrate consciousness, information, and technology in response to modern challenges. These approaches should not be directly copied but rather adapted by other societies in accordance with their national values, cultural mindset, and historical experience. The most important factor in forming ideological security is cognitive resilience, social cohesion, and an ideology-based immunity grounded in national identity.

In global socio-philosophical discourse, the issue of ideological security is viewed as a conceptual problem ensuring ethical, ideological, and cultural-civilizational stability. In particular, unlike the Western paradigm, the approaches of Russia, China, and Eastern countries to ideological security represent an alternative philosophical position to the universalistic model of modernism. These approaches are not based on humanistic-individualistic thinking influenced by modernist philosophy, but rather on collectivist, historico-civilizational consciousness and a state-centric social ontology. Therefore, the ideological security strategies of these countries express value supremacy rather than ideological dominance in the classical sense.

Russia's ideological security strategy is closely connected with the "neo-Eurasianism" concept developed by scholars such as Alexander Dugin, Natalia Narochnitskaya, and Sergey Karaganov. As Dugin argues, "Russia must defend its civilizational distinctiveness against the contradictory consequences of the Western paradigm." From a socio-philosophical perspective, this implies that society's identity reconstruction—i.e., the preservation of national ontology—is a fundamental condition of ideological security. Russia ensures ideological security through the principles of "traditional values," "cultural sovereignty," and "informational independence." The 2021 National Security Strategy of the



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Russian Federation identifies the erosion of moral values, the loss of historical memory, and the spread of Western nihilism among youth as ideological threats. This conceptualization frames ideological security as the protection of historical unity and civilizational heritage, in contrast to Western liberalism.

In Russian philosophical thought, this approach is explained through the continuity of social memory and cultural codes. Thinkers such as L.P. Karsavin and N.A. Berdyaev emphasized the connection between ideological stability and the “spirit of the people” (narodnyy dukh), arguing that its loss leads to the ontological decline of society. Contemporary ideological security policy draws on this philosophical heritage, positioning itself as an ideological shield protecting society from Western postmodern influence. In Russia, concepts such as “Russian Orthodoxy,” “historical pride,” and “civilizational strength” are used to form a national-philosophical foundation ensuring ideological stability.

From a philosophical standpoint, contemporary ideological threats operate through complex informational-symbolic systems that are subtle, highly sophisticated, and capable of strongly influencing consciousness. They aim to shift society from social reality to simulacral reality, from free choice to algorithmic choice, and from national identity to global consumer identity. Therefore, ideological security is no longer merely a political or military issue; it must be understood primarily as an ontological and epistemological problem.

In the context of modern ideological threats, preserving national idea and identity has become not only a political task but also a cultural-philosophical necessity for every state. In a global environment dominated by simulacra and cognitive manipulation, the stability of national ideology depends primarily on strengthening its cultural, social, and epistemological foundations. In this regard, various national strategies should be analyzed philosophically.



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Japan provides a notable example. By integrating modern technologies with samurai ethics, Shintoism, aesthetic traditions, and cultural heritage, Japan demonstrates a modernized yet continuous version of national identity. Through its “Cool Japan” strategy, the country exports its culture as a form of soft power; however, this exportation does not result in the loss of national memory but rather its globalization. This model can be interpreted through Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the “rhizome.”

South Korea also presents a remarkable case. Based on the cultural-philosophical phenomenon of “Han,” Korea has transformed its historical suffering into a global cultural narrative through pop culture, cinema, and art. In doing so, it has not only exported its national identity but also become a stable subject in global culture. The Korean model offers a “spiritual narrative” against informational simulation. Philosophically, this aligns with John Dewey’s ideas on education and cognitive formation.

France, in turn, builds its national identity on republicanism, secularism, and civic values, primarily transmitted through the education system. Here, national ideology functions as the moral core of society grounded in reason and culture. As Bourdieu and Althusser explain, ideological state apparatuses stabilize consciousness through structural formation.

The Russian Federation, particularly in recent decades, has sought to strengthen national ideology through state sovereignty, Orthodox values, and historical memory. The concept of the “Russkiy Mir” (Russian World) serves as one of the central narratives, presenting Russian language, culture, and Orthodoxy as an integrated cognitive space. Philosophically, this approach is close to Hegel’s idea of the “objective spirit.” In Turkey, national ideology is shaped through a synthesis of secular and religious elements. Since Atatürk’s era, a secular identity



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

has been formed, while in the 21st century religious symbols have been reintegrated. This model can be defined as a transmodern synthesis.

In Uzbekistan, since independence, the formation of national ideology has been based on historical memory, spiritual heritage, religious tolerance, modern development, and civic solidarity. In particular, within the framework of the “New Uzbekistan” concept, national ideology is no longer limited to the past but promotes advanced models of social consciousness for future development. In conclusion, the model of national ideological development in Uzbekistan represents a philosophical system based on the synthesis of socio-philosophical, cultural, and spiritual concepts. It is adaptive to temporal and spatial changes while preserving its identity foundation. It signifies the sovereignty of ideology, which is one of the most delicate yet decisive aspects of state independence in today’s information-driven world.

REFERENCES

1. Dugin, A. Foundations of Geopolitics: The Geopolitical Future of Russia. Moscow: Arktogeia, 1997.
2. Narochitskaya, N. Russia and the Russians in World History. Moscow: International Relations, 2003.
3. Karaganov, S. A. Russia’s Foreign Policy in the New Global Environment // Russia in Global Affairs. 2018.
4. Russian Federation. National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation. Moscow, 2021.
5. Karsavin, L. P. The Philosophy of History. St. Petersburg, 1923.
6. Berdyaev, N. A. The Fate of Russia. Paris, 1937.



International Conference on Computing, Artificial Intelligence and Information Systems

Hosted Online from Warsaw, Poland

Date: 11th April, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

7. Fukuyama, F. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992.
8. Gramsci, A. *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.
9. Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
10. Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
11. Althusser, L. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses // Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
12. Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
13. Dewey, J. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.