

CHANGES IN SOCIETY'S POLITICAL MENTALITY

Yusuffjanov Zahidjan,
Researcher, Namangan State University

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
<p>This article examines the transformational processes of the political mentality of society. The transformational processes of the political mentality of the society determine the changes shown in the thinking, working, communication and ideas of the society about political affairs. These processes depend on the reasons that took place in the society during a certain period or for many years and influenced the political mentality of the society.</p>	<p>State, society, management, political technology, management, discredit, political party, mentality.</p>

Introduction

In the majority of developed foreign countries, in the formation of public opinion, special attention is paid to research aimed at the realization of one's goals by using political technologies such as popularizing the personality of candidates in social networks, attracting public attention, and bringing the "human factor" to the first place. Currently, in a number of research centers operating in developed countries, scientific research is being conducted aimed at increasing the effectiveness of communication between the people and state authorities in order to solve important socio-economic problems.

In today's political speech, the formation of people's power, decision-making, or achieving democracy is relative in nature, and democracy has been observed in all eras.

In ancient Iran, the king considered himself "the direct representative and ambassador of God." For example, king Darius I carved the Behistun inscription on a rock at the end of the 6th century BC. This inscription states that "I am Darius, the great king, the king of kings, the king of the Persians, the king of all countries, the son of Vishtaspa, Arsham, Ahmonius... I am the king with the blessing of Ohura Mazda, Ohura Mazda has blessed me with the kingdom" [1. - S. 390.].

For both rulers and citizens, power and governance are of particular importance in solving social issues, because it is power that gives a person the opportunity to have a number of privileges and opportunities with a certain position. Therefore, the movement and struggle for power has been observed in all historical periods.

By the Middle Ages, both in the West and in the East, it became politically important to establish the rules and values set in the holy religious books in the elite and mass consciousness, and to attract as many people of other religions and entire peoples to the religious faith as possible.

In the Middle Ages, religion tries to legitimize its status as a power. Authority was established by God, who issued a fatwa that obedience to the church should reach the level of basic life requirements.

At the end of the Middle Ages, during the Reformation and the Renaissance, the struggle between religious and secular power reached its climax, the principle of secularism gradually began to settle in society, in Western Europe, the church began to be separated from state and government affairs, private production in the ratio of religious and secular power, capitalist relations historically. During its formation, the need for democracy began to be felt again.

People's power, the principle of democracy, a new era Western thinkers Sh. Montesquieu, J. Locke and T. It was put forward by Hobbes, the establishment of the principle of separation of powers in social life made a fundamental turn in the issue of authority, the theoretical buds of a new social life began to sprout, and the ideas of social utopia and communist society were historically formed. In this direction, French thinkers such as Saint Simon and Charles Fourier, and by the middle of the 19th century, K. Marx and F. Engels created a political theory about the socialist theory and the principle of the power of the working class [1. - S. 390.].

The answer to the question of what lies behind the fact that disparate models of state management take a firm place in practice is as follows: the direction of management and its organizational structure are determined by the direction of the worldview of society. Let's take a simpler aspect: in the thinking of Western peoples, each of the elements of the world - Nature - Society - Man is emphasized and separated from each other. Its downside is that an important aspect such as the internal functional connection between elements is turned into a partial, secondary factor over time. Giving too much priority to the principle of their separate analysis was later attached to the life and activities of citizens. In the West, the creed of cynicism "die for yourself" has clearly prevailed, which alienated the state and civil society in the pursuit of property and profit, let alone blood relatives. People forgot that the interests of the society and the state are the same, and that their livelihood depends on it. After all, in the West, the values of the family, the citizen's duty to the state have already been forgotten, and man has become a cosmopolitan with a passport in his pocket. In such conditions, it is almost impossible for the state power to manage the members of the society, which is a very complex system in itself. So, in the above environment, a completely different political culture has settled in the West and in the East. Most interestingly, this, in turn, increased the influence of an effective form of government called "soft authoritarianism". True, the East is vast, and even there the signs of "Western" behavior sometimes show themselves. What we are interested in is not individuality, but typological commonality characteristic of the East, that is, enlightened collectivism. Otherwise, today 70-80 percent of the world's population would not be inclined to collectivism.

In fact, the state is a symbol and embodiment of collective political intelligence. It is an institutionalized main factor that regulates and organizes interactions, relations and approaches in different directions, but aimed at one common interest [2. - S. 8.]. He has assumed political responsibility, and as responsible for it, he determines the management strategy, system and structures independently, based on the citizen's worldview, mentality and will. After all, there are many countries in the world that have fallen into a difficult situation and even ended their lives because of the artificial management style. Such a situation is more likely to occur in places where the political tension and impasse are primarily freed from colonial oppression, and at the root of which is a cultural crisis, leading to spiritual confusion as a result of serious mistakes in choosing an independent path.

It is no secret that such a complex and necessary problem as the administration of a common humanity, for a person living with some good hope and intention, has always had priority in the legacy of the thinkers of Muslim civilization. It is not easy to meet any philosopher, author of fiction and art,

especially a statesman in Muslim countries, who did not write it. Mutually beneficial dialogue between rulers and scientists, concerning the interests and goals of citizens, is a characteristic of the people of the East. Because the characteristic of Man is that he cannot live without communication. Communication, mutual understanding, exchange of ideas, experience is his nature, without it he is nothing and nobody. The tendency for dialogue and compromise, especially between state leaders and civil society, is both a political process and an age-old political institution. This is the difference between the situation in the Muslim world and the modern / western rule, where selfishness and law-abiding rule prevail.

The Uzbek mentality is an open system, which can accept the principles of universal democracy and the values of democratic statehood inherent in them as a structural element. The Uzbek mentality in the modernization of state administration does not prevent democratic changes, but because these changes are carried out in an archaic form in the historical memory of the people, with a sense of collectivity, respect for elders, and authority, the state encourages the public not to be apathetic and indifferent to the work of the majority, but to be socially active. Our wise people say, "Kars comes out of two hands." It is difficult to achieve any results if only the state, the President takes the initiative and is active, and the people and citizens do not support this initiative and activity. In this regard, according to the old tradition, increasing the social activity of society and citizens should not be limited to various events - telecommunications, conferences and television shows, on the contrary, in real life, state institutions are not a separate, superior force in communication with the people, but a concrete person and, in turn, solve various problems of the citizen. To do this, it is necessary to work in the style of a "kamarbasta" institution. "The people should serve our people, not the public bodies, but the public bodies should serve our people" is the essence of the old political paradigm.

Committed to the interests of the people in today's era of social renewal, [3. - S. 432–435.

] and it can be safely noted that an active political leader can decide the fate of the great democratic changes initiated by the people. A political leader who thinks about his own interests and personal well-being is the leader of the people, such a leader creates situations of social chaos, chaos, division within the society, and mutual opposition.

In this sense, President Sh. M. The five priority directions put forward by Mirziyoev and the five important initiatives that were later concretized are characterized by their content and essence of nationalism, deep approval and satisfaction for all layers of the population.

Establishing a legal state and civil society in Uzbekistan is recognized as a strategic task and goal. The essence of the "Strategy of Actions" is aimed at fulfilling this task and achieving the strategic goal. However, the local socio-political literature lacks conceptual clarity and concreteness here, which is a very serious problem. For example, the political categories of liberalism, democracy and modernization have not yet been logically explained. "Liberalism" means freedom and liberty, while "democracy" means "people's power". However, theoretically, questions arise as to how the legal state and the society based on self-governance of citizens, which the people of Uzbekistan are building, include the concepts of "liberalism" and "democracy" or what is the concrete place of liberalism or democracy in the structure of the theory of national democracy. Etymologically, the content of these concepts is known to one degree or another even by an ordinary reader today.

The transformational processes of the political mentality of the society determine the changes shown in the thinking, working, communication and ideas of the society about political affairs. These processes depend on the reasons that took place in the society during a certain period or for many years

and influenced the political mentality of the society. These processes can have the effect of changing the previous mentality, encouraging new ideas, thoughts and communication.

First, changes in technological trends play a major role in changing the political mentality of society. The Internet and social networks, chat and communication systems, and social media platforms have led to the creation of new opportunities for communicating the thoughts, ideas and communication of society members. Through this, the political mentality of the society has changed and many new ideas and thoughts have been enlightened.

Second, social reforms will be an important key factor in the transformation of the political mentality of the society. Social reforms are carried out in societies based on changing previous models of work, allowing democratic information, enlightening transparency, protecting human rights and freedoms, and economic modernization of foreign political and economic experiences. These reforms will change the political mentality of the society and lead to the increase of new ideas and dialogues.

Third, changes in political communications and work plans of governments can affect the transformation of the political mentality of society. New work plans aimed at strengthening freedom, transparency and cooperation can affect the transformation of the political mentality of society. Generally, governments use communication channels to provide political opinions to society, to present ideas and communicate ideas. Because through the development of communication technologies, it is possible to work through communication with the people, this situation leads to a change in the political mentality of the society.

Changes in organizational and organizational behavior lead to the transformation of the political mentality of society. For example, in democratic societies, new rules and norms aimed at strengthening partnership, work society and organizational powers of workers, human relations of agencies, cooperation and democratic dialogues are highlighted.

The changes shown in the field and economic affairs are also taken into account in changing the political mentality of the society. Issues related to the development of the economy, reduction of unemployment, injustice in social quality, insults, human rights coverage also affect the political mentality of the society.

Effectiveness and expansion of long-term political social networks also play an important role in changing the political mentality of society. When the community communicates through offensive and political social networks for a certain period of time, it opens up opportunities to clarify their ideas and strengthen cooperation through communication with relatives.

Community political mentality basically describes the political mentality in which people's discussions, dialogues, work plans and goals are possible regarding problems, social and political affairs.

Political mentality, nervous and negative situations, ways of working and thinking, especially transparency and communication in political affairs, are based on interests and preferences, perceptions and ideas, beliefs, traditions, rules and factors in dealing with others.

Community political mentality corresponds to the previously mentioned political mentality, mainly in terms of goals and ideas about society. In this mentality, influencing the political climate, political situation, cooperation and order of the society is based on important foundations.

The political mentality of a society can be different in every society because it depends on the historical, cultural, religious and economic factors of the society. Its formation is related to the history, educational, economic and political aspects of the society, as well as the population's education, literacy, organizational structures, documents and increased social status.

Their mentality determines their attitude to political affairs in society, how they organize things, how they communicate, and their relations with the people. The political mentality of society is formed in a certain period of life of members of the population, consumers, bodies organizing their work, social groups and people in the same society.

This membership will be able to influence social, economic and political affairs. The political mentality of a society is not immune to the non-political problems of a society, that is, it does not confirm them, it may even be ready to oppose them. The networks of the political mentality of society also influence religion, education, culture, history and other factors.

These mentalities are defined by the following characteristics in the same society:

Identity and governance issues: The political mentality of a society also includes excessive identity, national and political issues or governance models.

Thoughts and ideas: The political mentality of society is formed together with thoughts, ideas and scientific information, especially those related to political identity.

Communication and leadership: Communication and leadership in the political mentality of the society, development of relations with others from outside or inside is one of the important foundations.

Political Plans and Rules: The political mentality of the society requires setting certain parameters in relation to political plans and rules or reforming them.

Work Plans and Social Councils: The political mentality of the community observes the creation of a democratic society through work plans, social councils and other bodies, solving major problems and participating in problem solving.

In general, the political mentality of the society determines the political life, work, ideas and methods of their implementation. Their characteristics affect the history, culture, religious and economic factors of society.

Experience shows that practice and experience are important for sovereign states to raise their governance to the required level. There is an opportunity to understand management as a political instrument, to test it, to have a mutually beneficial dialogue with it. Therefore, independent countries have a fundamental interest in the excellence of educational international organizations. Such a situation, on the one hand, as a component of the world community, the sovereign state does not renounce its involvement in the common cause, its moral responsibility. However, there are a number of obstacles that have a negative impact on these objective pursuits, such as the intrusion of outright lies into the field of social (politics, economy, culture, spirituality, science, technology, etc.) [4. - S. 175-189.]. At the moment, we are talking about the mentality of sovereign states and, moreover, the "unreasonably alarming" practice of social networks in achieving the necessary order by directing world processes in the direction of human interests. The pros and cons of this tangled problem are almost equal. Sovereign states are bound to be overstressed by this volatile and rapidly changing situation in terms of the need for global governance.

References

1. История Древнего Востока. Текст и документы / Учебное пособие. Под. ред. В. И. Кузнецова. – М., 2002. – С. 390.
2. Семененко И.С. Горизонты ответственного развития: от научного дискурса к политическому управлению // Полис. – 2019. – №3. – С. 8.

3. Кадиров А., Обидов А. Логико-гносеологические измерения национального менталитета и национального характера узбекского народа / Ўзбекистонда фуқаролик жамияти ривожланишида миллий менталитетнинг ўрин ва роли. Республика илмий-амалий конференцияси материаллари. – Тошкент: ТДИУ, 2015. – С. 432–435.
4. Люлина А., Ефименко Е. Интернет – цензура: жесткий контроль и гибкая система урегулирования // Вестник РУДН. Серия Всеобщая история, 2022. Том 14. – №2. – С. 175-189.
5. Содиржонов М. Sociological analysis of human capital development processes //in Library. – 2023. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 246-254.
6. Sodirjonov M. M. INSON KAPITALI RIVOJLANISHIDA OLIY TA'LIMNING AHAMIYATI //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2023. – Т. 3. – №. 4. – С. 23-29.
7. Содиржонов М. Этносоциологик тадқиқотларда этник омиллар ва қарама-қаршиликлар //in Library. – 2021. – Т. 21. – №. 2. – С. 874-879.
8. Содиржонов М. Трансформация социального капитала в этносоциальных процессах //in Library. – 2021. – Т. 21. – №. 4. – С. 159-161.
9. Содиржонов М. Возможности оптимизации процессов развития человеческого капитала на пути инновационного развития //in Library. – 2020. – Т. 20. – №. 2. – С. 53-61.
10. Содиржонов, М. М. "Инсон капитали ривожланиш жараёнларининг этносоциологик хусусиятлари (Фарғона водийси мисолида). Социология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) диссертацияси." (2022).