BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR PROTECTING MILITARY CONSCIOUSNESS: MILITARY VALUES, IDEOLOGY, AND THE STABILITY OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Sodiqov Sarborbek Soxibjon o‘g‘li
Head of a Cycle at the Military Training Center of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24245313

Abstract: This article analyzes the socio-philosophical aspects of protecting the consciousness of military personnel from alien ideologies within the context of globalization and information warfare. It highlights the role of military values, national ideology, and spiritual-psychological stability as a shield against geopolitical threats.
Keywords: military consciousness, national ideology, military values, stability of consciousness, information-psychological attacks, patriotism, spiritual-psychological preparedness.

Today, the intensification of geopolitical competition globally, along with the rise of "hybrid wars" and information-psychological attacks, requires every state to strengthen its national security system—not only in material terms (such as weaponry and equipment) but also in spiritual and intellectual dimensions. The human factor—specifically the consciousness of the military serviceman—represents both the most vulnerable and the most potent aspect of military security. Even a heavily armed military can prove defenseless against alien ideologies if its soldiers and officers lack ideological immunity and mental resilience. Consequently, researching the socio-philosophical foundations for protecting the military consciousness has become one of the most pressing tasks for contemporary military science and philosophy.

In the context of modern information warfare, the issue of military security can no longer be addressed solely through military-technical measures or legal restrictions. As information-psychological influence expands, social consciousness—and military consciousness in particular—has emerged as a primary target in warfare. Therefore, the protection of military consciousness has evolved into a complex issue that demands socio-philosophical analysis. A military mindset is not merely a matter of discipline and obedience to orders; rather, it is a spiritual-cognitive state rooted in duty, loyalty, collective responsibility, and national identity. The stability of this mindset determines a society’s internal resilience against various manipulative influences within the information space. In information warfare, a military mindset is not explicitly rejected; instead, it is gradually weakened through the relativization of values, the erosion of ideological content, and the sowing of doubt regarding legal legitimacy.

From this perspective, the protection of a military mindset should not be limited solely to educational or ideological measures. This process must be carried out based on the mutual alignment of values, ideology, and law. Values provide meaning to military activity, ideology systematizes this meaning within the collective consciousness, and law safeguards it at an institutional level. The breakdown of any one of these three factors weakens the stability of the military mindset and intensifies internal risks to national security. Research has noted that the importance of ideological upbringing grows as ideological and conceptual processes intensify [1]. In social philosophy, a value is interpreted not merely as an abstract idea guiding human activity, but as an integrated unity of meaning, norms, and purpose. Within social consciousness, values serve as a primary regulator that stabilizes meaning, capable of directing human behavior even

in the absence of external control. Thus, a value is not just an answer to the question "what is good," but also encompasses the questions of "why" and "how."

The relationship between individual and social values is characterized by a complex dialectical interplay. Individual values cannot remain stable in isolation from social values; they only evolve into a coherent personal stance when integrated with social significance. In the military sphere, this relationship becomes even more critical: if personal interests are not subordinated to collective goals, a stable consciousness cannot be formed. Therefore, values do not restrict consciousness; rather, they protect it from excessive hesitation during the decision-making process. A consciousness devoid of values may be "free," but it is inherently unstable. The role of values in ensuring the stability of consciousness lies in their ability to preserve meaning, even when the flow of information is constantly shifting. In our view, a "stable consciousness" is one in which the established hierarchy of values remains intact [2].

8-Table

The connection between values and the stability of consciousness

Status of a value	Characteristic of consciousness	Result
Stable	Clear meaning	Decision is reliable
Relativized	Hesitation	Decision is weak
Lost	Indifference	Formal compliance

Military values do not negate universal human values; rather, they constitute a specialized system that reconfigures these values within the context of risk and responsibility. A primary distinguishing feature of military values is the capacity to make moral decisions even when facing danger. The interplay of risk, duty, and responsibility forms the central axis of military values. Stability is achieved when the category of "duty" is internalized within the military consciousness—not merely as a legal obligation, but as an intrinsic moral imperative. If duty is perceived merely as an external pressure, it results only in formal compliance.

The institutional nature of military values is rooted in the support they receive from the state and society. Once institutionalized, values evolve from personal perspectives into social norms, thereby fostering collective stability. Consequently, if military values are not established prior to the formation of an ideology, that ideology remains nothing more than an external slogan—whereas values constitute its true, internal substance.

In an environment characterized by information-psychological pressure, the relativization of values poses the most significant threat to the stability of the military consciousness. In a society where values are relativized, meanings are subject to constant reinterpretation, which ultimately causes the individual to lose their internal moral anchor. At the same time, the loss of meaning does not directly destroy consciousness; rather, it leaves it in a weakened state. In such a condition, a military person may carry out an order without internally embracing its underlying purpose. In our view, this should be characterized not as stability, but as "meaningless obedience." A crisis of values does not manifest as overt resistance; instead, it creates an internal void—a void that serves as the most fertile ground for information warfare.

In social philosophy, ideology is not viewed merely as a collection of ideas "imposed" upon consciousness from the outside, but rather as a system that constitutes social consciousness itself. Ideology is defined as a system of values and meanings that enables members of society to perceive, evaluate, and respond to reality. In this sense, ideology does not replace consciousness;

rather, it shapes its internal structure. Philosophically, it is crucial to distinguish between ideology and manipulation: within an ideological framework, the subject remains active, whereas in manipulation, the subject is reduced to a mere object of influence. Consequently, the stability of a military individual's consciousness is determined not by the mere presence of an ideology, but by how well that ideology aligns with their core values. It follows that ideology is not a tool for controlling consciousness, but rather a spiritual "framework" essential for preventing consciousness from losing its integrity. Manipulation, however, erodes this very framework.

9-Table

The difference between ideology and manipulation

Criterion	Ideology	Manipulation
Method of influence	Stabilizing meaning	Distorting meaning
State of the subject	Active	Passive
Time factor	Long-term	Short-term
Influence on consciousness	Reinforcement	Weakening

Military ideology is not merely a narrow, specialized subset of a broader, general ideology; rather, it is a distinct system that provides a moral foundation for action within contexts defined by risk and responsibility. A primary function of military ideology is to imbue service with meaning. If service is perceived solely as the execution of orders, one's consciousness remains merely formal—lacking true stability or depth.

At the core of military ideology lie patriotism and the inherent meaning of service. Patriotism is interpreted not as a mere emotion, but as a moral stance rooted in collective responsibility. Within this framework, service acquires a significance that transcends personal interest. Another vital function of military ideology is the cultivation of collective discipline. Such discipline is not the product of external control; rather, it remains stable only when a shared sense of purpose is embraced—a shared purpose that ideology itself creates. Consequently, an "ideological code" is essential for maintaining collective discipline. This ideological code—which fosters stability—functions as an internal mechanism within the military consciousness, integrating concepts of risk, duty, and responsibility into a unified system of meaning. Thus, military ideology does not merely produce obedience; it generates stability. Obedience can exist even in the absence of an ideology, but a stable consciousness cannot be formed without one [3].

In the context of information warfare, military ideology is not explicitly rejected; rather, it is reinterpreted through methods of "soft" influence. This process can be described as the erosion of an ideology's foundational values while its outward content remains intact. Consequently, the ideology is preserved in form, but its intrinsic substance is lost.

The shift of ideology into the symbolic realm is a key feature of the modern information space. Scholars have noted that ideological signals conveyed through symbols and images are absorbed more rapidly than those requiring rational analysis, leaving a deep imprint on the consciousness. This leads to the dissemination of military ideology through visual and emotional codes rather than explicit, textual statements. In information warfare, ideology is not destroyed—it is transformed into a symbol. Yet, when a symbol is stripped of its underlying meaning, it can no longer ensure the stability of consciousness.

In social philosophy, the stability of consciousness is often—and incorrectly—interpreted as rigidity or resistance to change. In reality, stability is not a static state; it is the capacity to maintain meaning and direction amidst changing social conditions. Stability—understood as spiritual-cognitive equilibrium—refers to the harmony between knowledge (the cognitive layer) and values (the spiritual layer) within the consciousness. Therefore, stability in a military mindset does not mean resisting change, but rather ensuring one does not become lost amidst that change. A stable consciousness maintains its orientation.

Stability in a military mindset is not an abstract state; rather, it manifests through concrete criteria. A comparative analysis of the works of Uzbek philosophers reveals that this stability is formed across three fundamental layers.

Cognitive stability is the preservation of the capacity for analytical thinking amidst information flows, contradictory messages, and psychological pressure. It is defined as the ability to maintain logical consistency in decision-making, even in the face of information overload.

Value-based stability entails ensuring that core values—such as duty, loyalty, and responsibility—do not become subject to relativism. It has been observed that when value-based stability is compromised, the consciousness becomes entirely dependent on external control.

Identificational stability refers to the internal acceptance of the social role: "I am a military person." In our view, the weak link in this stability is not always cognitive; often, it erodes at the level of values or identity.

Within the military system, stability is frequently conflated with obedience. However, philosophical analysis reveals that obedience is not a prerequisite for stability. Obedience can be distinguished as an adaptation to external demands, whereas stability represents an internal, moral acceptance. Active agency is the hallmark of a stable consciousness; where such agency remains intact, an individual does not merely execute an order but understands and embraces its underlying purpose.

The danger of purely formal obedience arises when the stability of one's consciousness begins to erode. In such a state, military discipline may be maintained on the surface, yet the internal motivation has vanished. A stable consciousness obeys because it understands; an unstable consciousness obeys because it is compelled. While these two states may appear similar from the outside, they are strategically entirely different.

In social philosophy, the effectiveness of an ideology is determined not by its external forms, but by the depth of its connection to core values. Rather than viewing an ideology as a system detached from values, it is better understood as a moral construct that derives its meaning precisely through those values. Therefore, an ideology devoid of values cannot strengthen social consciousness; it remains merely declarative and formal in its impact. This is particularly significant in the military sphere, as ideology provides meaning to decision-making amidst danger and uncertainty. Furthermore, the reinforcement of values by an ideology is a reciprocal process: while values imbue an ideology with substance, the ideology, in turn, activates these values within social life. Without values, an ideology devolves into an empty external slogan; conversely, without an ideology, values remain fragmented. A stable consciousness is formed only through the harmonious integration of the two.

10-Table

A comparison of the interaction between values and ideology

Status	Values	Ideology	Result

Status	Values	Ideology	Result
Consistent	Stable	Substantive	Mental stability
Partial	Relative	Formal	Hesitation
Disconnected	Weak	Declarative	Formal obedience

In the context of information warfare, ideological influence is exerted not through the overt rejection of values, but through their reinterpretation. For instance, the value of "duty" is retained, yet it is placed on an equal footing with personal interest.

In information warfare, the shifting of values is primarily achieved through symbols, context, and emotional imagery. This leads the military consciousness to perceive duty not as a moral imperative, but as a choice contingent upon the situation. It is here that the dialectic between "duty" and "interest" intensifies. Information-psychological influence presents this very equivalence as the "norm." Information warfare does not eliminate duty; rather, it pits duty against personal interest. This competition erodes the stability of the military consciousness.

Philosophical analysis indicates that the stability of the military consciousness cannot be consistently maintained when the harmony between values and ideology is disrupted. Consequently, a lack of alignment between the moral and cognitive dimensions can exacerbate internal contradictions within the consciousness.

The risks arising from such a disruption include the formalization of ideology, the relativization of values, and the weakening of collective identity. It has been observed that while military discipline may be maintained in its external aspects, internal stability is lost. When the harmony between values and ideology is disrupted, consciousness transforms into a system controlled from the outside. Stability, however, exists only through internal harmony.

In social philosophy, law is viewed not merely as a collection of prohibitions and restrictions, but as a social institution that safeguards values. It should serve to preserve meaning rather than to constrain human activity. From this perspective, within the military sphere, law establishes duty and responsibility—not as mere external obligations, but as legitimate moral requirements.

The approach that defines law as protection rather than restriction is particularly significant for military values. Where law is severed from morality, it devolves into a formal obligation; conversely, where morality and law are in harmony, internal acceptance and conviction emerge. Consequently, legal norms should foster an understanding of duty within the military consciousness—not as a matter of external control, but as one of internal responsibility. Law does not "control" the military consciousness; rather, it empowers it to defend its own values. In this sense, law serves as the institutional foundation for stability.

The legal reinforcement of military values is achieved through institutionalization. Institutionalization can be viewed as the process of transforming values from personal beliefs into collective norms. Laws and norms facilitate precisely this process. The institutionalization of values through laws and norms establishes stable standards within the military consciousness. Analyses indicate that a law becomes effective only when it reinforces duty not merely as an external requirement, but as a value recognized by society as a whole [4].

The military oath, duty, and responsibility constitute the core components of these legal-moral mechanisms. The military oath carries a significance that extends beyond a mere legal act; it is understood as an individual's act of moral self-obligation toward the collective. By linking legal accountability with moral responsibility, the oath strengthens stability within the military

consciousness. In our view, values are not rendered mandatory through law; rather, through law, they evolve into shared norms. The distinction lies here: stability arises not from obligation, but from legitimacy.

In conclusion, safeguarding the military consciousness is not merely a technical or tactical task; it is a profound socio-philosophical process that defines the existence and sovereignty of the state. An army equipped with steadfast military values, a robust national ideology, and a high level of spiritual resilience is capable of neutralizing any modern or hybrid threats. Consequently, strengthening the role of socio-philosophical disciplines within the system of military personnel training—and further fostering a sense of responsibility for the fate of the Motherland in the hearts of soldiers and officers—remains a top priority for national security.

References

1. Xodjayev O.Sh. Yangi O'zbekistonda g'oyaviy-mafkuraviy jarayonlar intensivlashuvida g'oyaviy tarbiyaning ahamiyati // Jamoat xavfsizligi. -2024. -№ 2. -B. 176-179.
2. To'rayev B. Ong barqarorligi muammolari. -Toshkent: Universitet, 2017. -48–51-b.
3. Jo'rayeva N. Vatanparvarlikning ijtimoiy mazmuni. -Toshkent: Falsafa va huquq, 2016. -88–91-b.
4. Jo'rayeva N. Huquqiy me'yor va burch kategoriyasi. -Toshkent: Falsafa va huquq, 2016. -94–97-b.