



THE ESSENCE OF THE CONTENT OF POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

Alimbetova.G.A.

Karakalpak State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7440205>

It is theoretically emphasized that the concept of political ideology, that is, the idea that political views and attitudes are interconnected in a coherent system, is an important condition, especially for a well-functioning democracy.

Politically qualified citizens are needed to provide accurate information when setting public policy. If citizens have a constantly changing and inconsistent attitude towards state policy, it will be difficult for representatives to interpret the demands and wishes of voters. The importance of ideology lies in the fact that political ideological views are more vividly manifested in large-scale studies showing how they affect the behavior of the individual.

Ideology is one of the concepts that is difficult to describe among all social sciences. The first problem we face when discussing the essence of ideology is the lack of a mutually agreed definition among scientists. According to the English scientist Andrew Haywood, one of the reasons for this is: "firstly, since all the concepts of ideology accept the existence of a connection between theory and practice, this term, on the one hand, gives rise to a much more acute relationship of the role of ideas in politics and the relationship between beliefs and theories, and, on the other, Secondly, the concept of ideology could not stand out from the ongoing struggle between political ideologies. His historical adventures in most, the concept of ideology was applied as a weapon or tool to attack rival ideas or belief systems. Until the second half of the XX century, the concept of impartial and clearly expressed ideology was not widely used"[1].

Most recent studies on the term ideology (ideology) claim that the word was introduced into science in the modern sense by a group of thinkers during the French Revolution. Antoine Louis Claude Destutt de Tracy first mentioned the term in an article entitled "Memory of Pensee" at the French Institute in Paris between 1796 and 1798.

A group of people who later called themselves ideologists, including Cabanis, Condorcet, constant, Daunou, say, Madame de Stael and others, acted as "thinking" representatives of the French Revolution. Their goal was to practically realize freedom of speech and thought in society. The term ideology consists of a combination of the Greek words "Eidos" (eidos) and "logos" (logos), which can be considered "the science of ideas". This word was included in the dictionary of the French Academy of Sciences in 1835[2].

The first application of the concept of ideology dates back to the era of the French Revolution. One of the intellectuals known as "ideologists", Destutt de Tracy, used the phrase in 1797 in his first application, in the sense of "the science of ideas that must be applied to allow everyone to think correctly".

Enlightened philosophers believed that ideology contributes to the "light of reason". In their opinion, ideology performs a positive function "against passion, prejudice and dirty interests that block consciousness."

A detailed study of the concept of ideology helps to better understand it and determine its impact on people. It turned out that the connection of ideology with science, philosophy and religion was studied by scientists and was different from all three. It was understood that ideology presents itself as an absolute truth in the face of the falsification of Science, and ideology does not tolerate criticism, unlike the method of philosophy based on questioning. Ideology is the closest concept to religion.

In a context where ideology forms a false consciousness and seduces people all over the world, a person's relationship with ideology plays an important role. The approach of modernity and rationality to the human mind, based on absolute possession, laid the foundation for the emergence of great ideologies built by reason. Postmodern criticism of human consciousness may have the opportunity to protect people from the destructive influence of ideologies in the coming centuries.

The study of ideology also presents many difficulties. First, there is no agreed general definition of ideological concept.

The second difficulty is that the concept was developed not only on the basis of scientific, but also on the basis of political approaches.

The author of the first negative views and relations on the concept of ideology is Napoleon. Napoleon, who initially supported ideologists by giving them the opportunity to spread their ideas, later changed this attitude. As religious institutions lifted the ban on education, he accused them of "metaphysics" when they received criticism from ideologists.

Most scholars call ideology "the most difficult concept within the entire social sciences" [3]. We choose a simple, general and non-controversial definition of political ideology proposed by Erickson and Tedin[4], that is, the definition of "the correct order of society and the set of beliefs about how it can be achieved."

Denzau and Norz also offer a similar quality, only they emphasize the role of social groups or communities in this process: "ideologies are groups of individuals that are general mental models that provide insights into the interpretation of the environment and how this environment should be structured"[5]

If one accepts that ideology is general, that it helps to interpret the social world and that it rationally defines (or requires) good and correct ways to solve life problems, then it is easy to understand how ideology reflects and enhances things as relationships, epistemic and existential needs or motives that psychologists can refer to[6].

Particular ideologies crystallize and manifest in themselves the common (but not unanimous) beliefs, views, and values of a defined group, class, constituency, or society[7]. Ideologies also seek to describe or interpret the world as it is, by making claims or assumptions about human nature, historical events, current realities and future possibilities, and to imagine the world as it should be, determining optimal ways to achieve social, economic goals and political ideals. Because different ideologies express socially general but competitive life philosophies and how to live (and how to control society), they must produce and express strong societal ideologies based on motivational styles or trends of their supporters[8].

Overcoming historical tension between critical and neutral approaches

Philosophers and social scientists have long had various discussions about the adoption of a neutral pose with greater value, critical or alternatively, in the description and analysis of ideologies. Previously, in critical traditions, ideology (as opposed to science) was generally viewed as a potentially dangerous form of delusions and mystifications that served to hide

and maintain exploitative social relationships. Another scientist Manngem [9] described certain ideologies as a form of "more or less conscious concealment of the true essence of the situation." Habermas [10] also viewed ideology as a form of "systematically distorted communication", and this description is common in some circles of social theorists. However, according to many empirical studies in sociology, psychology and political science, "ideology" refers to any system of beliefs, that is, to any "configuration of ideas and relationships" in which there are elements linked to each other by some kind of restriction or functional interdependence. According to this point of view, ideology is considered as a "relatively good organizational tool" [11] and its cognitive function of shaping political knowledge and experience is highlighted. Researchers conclude that members of a society are ideological only if they have a stable, logical, consistent and relatively broad thinking or knowledge-based relationship [12].

Opinions arising from critical and neutral inquiries were often put side by side and assumed to be incompatible with one another, and scholars of the two traditions rarely (if any) seem to have communicated with one another. However, we propose that these two approaches do not exclude each other, since the same belief systems can perform several (that is, epistemic, existential and relationship) functions at the same time. That is, we propose that a certain ideology can reflect real (and even very specific) attempts to understand, interpret and regulate information about the political world, as well as conscious or unconscious tendencies to rationalize the existence of things.

While manngem introduced the concepts of utopia and ideology into science, he described ideology as "outdated belief", "a set of myths, norms and ideals that are separated from reality, outdated." Utopia, on the other hand, was called a proven concept as a meaning, even though it was considered "unreal" for appearing before its time" [13]. According to manngem, four important examples of utopia have appeared in modern history. These are: (1) the belief that great and supernatural changes will occur in the Millennium, (2) the liberal humanitarian view, (3) conservative thought, and (4) communist-socialist views.

Gramsci introduced the concept of "hegemony" into science and used this concept in his analysis. Against the view that the ruling bourgeois state in the West oppresses workers, he distinguished differences in ideology through the joint application of the concepts of power and consent. According to him, along with the oppressive aspect of the bourgeois state, which is endowed with force, there is also a "persuasive" aspect [14]. Gramsci believes that the state can use two tools to keep society under control: "coercion" and "consent".

The means by which the ruling class is accepted and "agreed" by society without the use of force and without open pressure is an ideology called hegemony by the scientist. The concept of hegemony between the state and society is said to encompass all intermediary institutions, such as schools, the army, the press, the family, religious institutions.

Another thinker who advocates combining ideology with power is Habermas. The scientist notes that ideology, which is a "form of communication systematically violated by the authorities," becomes a "weapon of domination and serves to legitimize the relationship of power." Another important finding of Habermas is that he pays special attention to the communicative structure of the language. The scientist noted that more emphasis should be placed on the colloquial aspect of ideology [15].

While re-developing Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Althusser introduced the concept of "ideological apparatus of the state" into science. In his opinion, there is no contradiction in the

economic, political and ideological spheres in the formation of social formation. With "schools, the media and other ideological means", the state "re-produces social relations and strengthens its Rule" [16].

Altusser put forward a strong ideological thesis, that is, the idea that a clear distinction can be made between science and ideology. Accordingly; "unlike the open and revolutionary nature of science, ideology has a closed, cyclical and self-affirming character" [17]. Altusser believes that ideology is neither scientific nor rational, nor unconscious relationships. He reminds us of preconceived attachment methods to social reality" [18].

Approaching ideology as a "cultural problem", Gouldner comments on the end of its social formation. Ideology upon completion of social formation:

- (1) to the hegemonic ideology that comes to power and strengthens its rule,
- (2) becomes a critical language that exceeds the status quo and a common culture by those involved in criticism [19].

Gouldner believes that ideology requires "separation from religious belief or mythological understanding." According to this, ideology is not connected with the metaphysical field, but with the physical sphere. Unlike Hegel's rationalism, Schopenhauer leads ideology to the level of "false consciousness" or "false idea" with his view that "there is no place for Reason in reality", "being conscious means being deceived" [20].

Nissehe gives ideology two different meanings: the first; it is the view that "ideas are just an imaginary rationalization of passions and interests." The latter, on the other hand, corresponds to the "stagnant area of metaphysical values abstracted from history" [21].

One of the last and very important innovations added to the concept of ideology is the disclosure of its connection with characters in language and speech. Voloshinov draws attention to the material notes of speech, saying that "the main element of the articulation of language is the sign, and the signs are the material notes of meaning." The scientist came to the conclusion that without writing there would be no ideologies, and speech is the same as ideology, expressing that the sphere of influence of characters and ideology occupies one place and time.

Voloshinov believes that "characters are not a reflection of reality, but an integral part of it." Thus, the semiotic definition of ideology takes its place as a "struggle of opposing social interests." Such a definition of voloshinov's concept of ideology makes an important contribution by introducing the fundamental difference of the approach.

From the origin of the above, it can be said that ideology is an example of a symbolically imposed belief and expression that presents, interprets and evaluates the world in a certain way. Ideologies are designed to form certain directions of action and reject others.

References:

- 1.Хейвуд, Э. Политология. Пер. с англ. под ред. Г.Г. Водолазова, В.Ю. Вельского. — М., 2005. — 544 с.
- 2.Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, Paris, 1932-1935
- 3.McLellan D. 1986. Ideology. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press.
- 4.Erikson RS, Tedin KL. 2003. American Public Opinion. New York: Longman. 6th ed.
- 5.Denzau AD, North DC. 1994/2000. Shared mental models: ideologies and institutions. In Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of



6. Jost JT, Ledgerwood A, Hardin CD. 2008a. Shared reality, system justification, and the relational basis of ideological beliefs. *Soc. Personal. Psychol. Compass* 2:171–86.
7. Knight K. 2006. Transformations of the concept of ideology in the twentieth century. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 100:619–26.
8. Jost JT. 2006. The end of the end of ideology. *Am. Psychol.* 61:651–70.
9. Mannheim K. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harvest Books, p 55.
10. Habermas J. 1989. *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume Two*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
11. Knight K. 2006. Transformations of the concept of ideology in the twentieth century. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 100:619–26.
12. Converse PE. 2000. Assessing the capacity of mass electorates. *Annu. Rev. Pol. Sci.* 3:331–53.
13. Манхейм Карл. Избранное: Диагноз нашего времени. — Москва: РАО Говорящая книга, 2010. — С. 7. — 744 с.
14. Антонио Грамши. Искусство и политика. В двух томах / пер. с итал. Смирнов Г. П., Ошеров С. А.. — Москва: Искусство, 1991. — 127 с. .
15. Хабермас Ю. Модерное сознание времени и его потребность в самоуверенности // *Философские науки*. 1997. № 2, 3, 4.
16. Atkinson, D. *The Anatomy of Knowledge: Althusser's Epistemology and its Consequences* // *Philosophical Papers*. — 1984. — Vol. 13, № 2. — P. 1—19
17. Atkinson, D. *The Anatomy of Knowledge: Althusser's Epistemology and its Consequences* // *Philosophical Papers*. — 1984. — Vol. 13, № 2. — P. 1—19
18. Atkinson, D. *The Anatomy of Knowledge: Althusser's Epistemology and its Consequences* // *Philosophical Papers*. — 1984. — Vol. 13, № 2. — P. 1—19
19. Гоулднер А. Наступающий кризис западной социологии. — СПб.: Наука, 2003. — 575 с.
20. Каранг: Terry Eagleton (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 131.
21. BA Kurbanovna. Trends in parliamentary effectiveness in ensuring the development of society. *Восточно-европейский научный журнал*, 33-36, 2020
22. BA Kurbanovna. Development And Role Of Representative Authority In The Development Of Society, *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching* 2, 113-117, 2021
23. JI Вахытовна. Science in the Republic of Karakalpakstan. *European journal of business startups and open society* 2 (3), 82-85, 2022
24. IB Jollibekova. Training of personel in the Republic of Karakalpakstan in the years of Independence. *Science and Education in Karakalpakstan* 2 (2), 104-108, 2019
25. IB Jollibekova. International Relations in the field of education in the Republic of Karakalpakstan. *Science and Education in Karakalpakstan* 2 (2), 93-99, 2018
26. ИБ Жоллыбекова. Вопросы оценки образования в современных условиях. атериалы международной научно-практической конференции 1 (2), 69-71, 2017
27. IB Jollibekova. Features of the development of International economic relations Republic of Karakalpakstan at the present stage. I *International Conference on Suistanble Development and Economics* 1 (1 ..., 2017)
28. IB Jollibekova. Peculiarities of development of international economic relations of the Republic of Karakalpakstan. *Europe Applied Science. Europaiche Fachhochshule* 1 (1), 400-402, 2015