

РОЗДІЛ 3. ПОЛІТИЧНА КУЛЬТУРА ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЯ

Deniz Valiyeva Fikrat

The impact of authority on political culture in non-democratic regimes

UDC 323.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-9616.2025-4.18>

9616.2025-4.18

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії

CC BY 4.0

Deniz Valiyeva Fikrat

Postgraduate Student at the Department
of Diplomacy and Modern Integration
Processes

Baku State University

Academician Zakhid Khalilov str., 23,

Baku, Azerbaijan

ORCID: 0009-0007-7095-7149

*This study examines the multifaceted impact of authority on political culture in non-democratic regimes, focusing on how ideological control, political socialization, and coercive mechanisms shape societal attitudes and behaviors. Drawing upon the theoretical insights of Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Louis Althusser's ideological state apparatuses, and James C. Scott's theory of hidden transcripts, the research investigates the ways in which authoritarian regimes manipulate cultural and political norms to maintain legitimacy and suppress dissent. **The primary objective** is to explore how such regimes, despite their diversity in historical and geographical contexts, deploy similar strategies, ranging from state-controlled education and mass media propaganda to extensive surveillance and targeted repression, to reinforce loyalty and discourage political pluralism. Through a comparative case study of China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Belarus, the analysis highlights patterns of both continuity and adaptation in authoritarian governance. **Methodologically**, the study integrates qualitative document analysis with comparative political sociology, assessing primary and secondary sources, including state policy documents, media content, and scholarly literature. It identifies how propaganda campaigns, educational curricula, institutionalized rituals, and controlled civic engagement function to sustain regime narratives while simultaneously marginalizing opposition. Furthermore, it addresses the paradox that excessive coercion, while effective in short-term compliance, may undermine long-term stability by fostering latent opposition and eroding public trust. **The findings suggest** that political culture in authoritarian contexts is not a static entity but a dynamic arena of contestation where societal agency persists beneath the surface of compliance. Adaptive strategies, such as selective participation, private dissent, digital activism, and cultural subversion, gradually reshape political norms, challenging the hegemonic narratives of ruling elites. The study concludes that while non-democratic regimes can adjust to shifting socio-political realities, structural forces such as economic modernization, technological advancement, and generational change inevitably transform political culture over time.*

Key words: Authoritarianism, Political Culture, Political Socialization, Resistance, Ideological Control.

Introduction. The impact of authority on political culture in non-democratic regimes remains a highly relevant topic in contemporary political analysis due to the persistence and evolution of authoritarian governance across various regions. As global political dynamics shift, with rising authoritarian tendencies even in formally democratic states, understanding how authority shapes political culture is critical for assessing both regime stability and the prospects for political change. In the 21st century, technological advancements have provided authoritarian regimes with new tools for social control, such as digital surveillance, algorithmic censorship, and state-sponsored disinformation, further embedding authoritarian political cultures. At the same time, economic interdependence, transnational activism, and global communication networks create tensions between authoritarian control and societal demands for greater political participation. The resilience of authoritarian regimes in China, Russia, and the Middle East demonstrates that non-democratic systems are not static; they adapt to internal and external pressures by reshaping political norms, narratives, and participation mechanisms. Moreover, the role of international actors in legitimizing or challenging authoritarianism, through economic partnerships, geopolitical alliances, or sanctions, further com-

plicates the interaction between authority and political culture. In an era of declining global democratic indices and increasing political polarization, analyzing how authority influences political culture is essential for understanding both the survival strategies of autocratic regimes and the conditions under which political transformation might occur.

In this regard, **the main purpose of this research** is to analyze how authority influences political culture in non-democratic regimes, focusing on the mechanisms of control, processes of socialization, and the dynamics of resistance and adaptation.

By employing a theoretical framework grounded in political sociology, this study integrates concepts from Gramsci's theory of hegemony, Althusser's ideological state apparatuses, and Scott's hidden transcripts to explore how political culture is both shaped and contested under authoritarian rule.

Methodologically, this research adopts a comparative analysis of historical and contemporary non-democratic regimes, drawing on case studies from China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Belarus to illustrate how political culture evolves under varying degrees of state control and opposition. Through qualitative analysis of state propaganda, political institutions, media censorship, and grassroots resistance movements,

the study examines how citizens navigate and respond to authoritarian governance. The findings contribute to academic discourse by advancing a nuanced understanding of political cultural change in non-democratic settings, challenging deterministic views that perceive authoritarian political cultures as static. By emphasizing the dynamic nature of political culture, shaped by ideological conditioning, institutional reinforcement, and societal agency, this research provides insights into the conditions under which political transformation may occur, thus offering theoretical and empirical contributions to political sociology, authoritarianism studies, and democratization research.

Mechanisms of Authority Control Over Political Culture. In non-democratic political systems, authority exercises significant control over political culture to maintain legitimacy, suppress dissent, and ensure political stability. Political culture, defined as the collection of attitudes, values, and beliefs that shape political behavior, is neither static nor immune to manipulation by ruling elites. Political theory offers several frameworks to understand how authoritarian regimes consolidate power through ideological control, institutional mechanisms, and coercive means. Theories of hegemony, political socialization, and state propaganda elucidate the processes through which authority molds political culture to sustain its rule. In this regard, Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony provides a foundational understanding of how authority shapes political culture through ideological dominance. According to Gramsci, the ruling class does not solely rely on coercion but also secures consent through cultural and intellectual leadership. In non-democratic regimes, state-controlled media, education systems, and religious institutions serve as vehicles for disseminating official ideology, reinforcing narratives that justify the regime's rule. For instance, the Soviet Union institutionalized ideological control through the education system, where Marxist-Leninist doctrine was deeply embedded in curricula from an early age. The Communist Party ensured that alternative political ideologies were systematically excluded, shaping a political culture that equated loyalty to the state with national progress. Similarly, in China, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) promotes "socialism with Chinese characteristics" through educational programs and media campaigns, thereby shaping public perceptions of governance, democracy, and economic development [2].

In modern authoritarian states, digital platforms have become a key instrument in ideological control. Governments employ internet censorship and algorithmic manipulation to suppress alternative narratives while amplifying state-sponsored discourse. For example, in Russia, the Kremlin exercises extensive control over digital media through laws regulating "foreign agents" and cyber surveillance, ensuring that narratives critical of the state remain marginalized [11].

Political Socialization and Institutional Reinforcement

Political socialization, the process by which individuals internalize political values and norms, is another crucial mechanism through which authority exerts control over political culture. Institutional reinforcement—via education, bureaucracy, and state-affiliated organizations—ensures that political attitudes are aligned with the regime's interests. Authoritarian states frequently integrate loyalty to the ruling elite into national identity. In North Korea, political socialization begins in childhood through the "Kimilsungist-Kimjongilist" ideological framework, where citizens are taught to revere the Kim dynasty as an extension of the nation itself. The education system, cultural production, and even family life are structured to ensure deep internalization of this ideology, leaving little room for independent political thought [4].

Moreover, institutions such as youth organizations, trade unions, and professional associations play a role in reinforcing regime-aligned political culture. In Saudi Arabia, for instance, state-sponsored Islamic institutions promote interpretations of religious doctrine that emphasize obedience to political authority. By controlling religious discourse, the state ensures that political opposition is framed as both un-Islamic and destabilizing.

Another dimension of institutional reinforcement is bureaucratic control over civic engagement. In many non-democratic states, political parties are either tightly controlled or outright banned, limiting avenues for political participation. In Iran, the Guardian Council, an unelected body, pre-screens candidates for elections, effectively eliminating any meaningful opposition and ensuring that political culture remains within the bounds set by the ruling elite.

State Propaganda and the Cultivation of Fear

State propaganda serves as a direct mechanism for shaping political culture by influencing public perception of governance, opposition, and national identity. Authoritarian regimes deploy extensive propaganda campaigns that portray the ruling elite as protectors against external threats, internal chaos, or moral decay. For example, in Nazi Germany, Joseph Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda effectively controlled all aspects of media, art, and public discourse to instill a political culture centered on loyalty to the Führer. Through film, literature, and mass rallies, the Nazi regime crafted an image of an infallible leader and an existential threat posed by political and ethnic "enemies" [8].

Modern authoritarian regimes continue to employ state propaganda, albeit with more sophisticated techniques. In contemporary non-democratic regimes, the government's control over mainstream media has allowed it to cultivate a political culture where opposition parties are frequently framed as traitors or foreign agents. The state's rhetoric emphasizes national unity against supposed internal and external threats, reinforcing the narrative that the ruling party is the sole guardian of stability and progress.

Beyond propaganda, the cultivation of fear is another mechanism through which political culture is controlled. In states with widespread surveillance and political repression, citizens internalize self-censorship as a survival strategy [3, p. 101]. The concept of the “panopticon,” developed by Michel Foucault, explains how surveillance creates a society where individuals regulate their own behavior under the assumption that they are being watched. In China, the development of the Social Credit System exemplifies this mechanism, as it not only monitors but also rewards or punishes individuals based on their political and social behaviors, subtly shaping their participation in political life [10].

Coercion and Repression as a Means of Cultural Control

While ideological and institutional mechanisms play a significant role, direct coercion remains a fundamental tool for controlling political culture in non-democratic regimes. The use of political repression, from censorship to imprisonment and extrajudicial killings, deters dissent and shapes a political culture of compliance. In this regard, the Soviet Union’s use of the KGB to suppress dissent ensured that alternative political ideas could not take root. In modern Russia, the assassination and imprisonment of political activists, such as Alexei Navalny, serve as stark reminders that opposition carries severe consequences. Similarly, in Belarus, the government of Alexander Lukashenko has used mass arrests, torture, and forced exile to eliminate dissent, fostering a political culture where open opposition is both dangerous and rare.

In some cases, regimes use symbolic violence to instill fear without necessarily resorting to mass repression. The display of political prisoners, public trials, and state-orchestrated smear campaigns contribute to an atmosphere where dissent appears futile. In Egypt, for example, mass trials of opposition figures serve not only as a legal instrument but also as a cultural message that opposition to the regime will not be tolerated.

To sum up, the control of political culture in non-democratic regimes is a multifaceted process that combines ideological hegemony, political socialization, propaganda, and coercion. Drawing from political theory, Gramsci’s hegemony explains the soft power of ideological control, while Foucault’s surveillance society illustrates the self-regulation of behavior under authoritarian rule. Real-world examples from China, Russia, North Korea, and Saudi Arabia demonstrate how these mechanisms manifest in contemporary politics. Ultimately, the ability of authoritarian regimes to maintain control over political culture determines their longevity, but it is also subject to resistance, adaptation, and eventual change. Political culture, while shaped by authority, is never entirely static, as shifts in social, economic, and technological contexts create opportunities for alternative narratives to emerge.

Political Socialization and Legitimacy in Non-Democratic Regimes. Political socialization is a lifelong process through which individuals acquire and internalize political norms and values. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba (1963) conceptualized political culture as a determinant of regime stability, distinguishing between three types: parochial, subject, and participant cultures. While democracies cultivate participant political cultures that encourage active engagement, authoritarian regimes foster subject cultures that emphasize obedience and discourage critical political thought. Louis Althusser’s theory of ideological state apparatuses (1971) provides a framework for understanding how institutions such as schools, religious organizations, and media function to instill state-approved political beliefs. Althusser argues that the state does not rely solely on coercion but also uses ideology to manufacture consent. This perspective is particularly relevant in authoritarian regimes, where education systems, state-controlled media, and cultural narratives are carefully curated to reinforce legitimacy. Similarly, Antonio Gramsci’s theory of hegemony explains how non-democratic regimes maintain power through ideological dominance rather than mere coercion. By controlling cultural and intellectual production, the ruling elite ensures that alternative political discourses remain marginalized, making regime legitimacy appear natural and unquestionable.

Education as a Tool of Political Socialization

Education is one of the most effective mechanisms for shaping political attitudes, particularly in non-democratic regimes where curricula are designed to legitimize the ruling elite and suppress oppositional narratives [5]. The content of history, civics, and literature courses is carefully curated to instill a sense of loyalty to the regime. For example, in North Korea, the education system is built around the ideological framework of Juche, or self-reliance, which emphasizes the absolute authority of the Kim dynasty. Textbooks glorify the leadership and demonize external influences, creating a political culture where dissent is nearly unthinkable [4]. Political indoctrination begins in early childhood, ensuring that citizens view the regime’s rule as both natural and benevolent.

Similarly, in China, the Communist Party uses education to shape political consciousness. Patriotic education campaigns emphasize the role of the CCP in modernizing China and portray democratic movements, such as the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests, as dangerous threats to national stability. The inclusion of “Xi Jinping Thought” in school curricula further reinforces the ideological alignment of young citizens with state policies, ensuring that future generations internalize the party’s legitimacy [6, p. 781].

In Russia, the Kremlin has increasingly emphasized a revisionist historical narrative in education, portraying the Soviet Union’s past in a favorable light while downplaying Stalinist repression [9, p. 29]. The

inclusion of state-approved textbooks that glorify Russian nationalism serves to reinforce Putin's leadership as a continuation of Russia's historical greatness.

Media and Propaganda as Instruments of Legitimacy

In non-democratic regimes, the media plays a crucial role in political socialization by shaping public perception of governance, opposition, and political alternatives. Unlike in democratic societies, where media serves as a platform for debate and accountability, authoritarian regimes use media as a tool for information control and manipulation. State-controlled media reinforces legitimacy by emphasizing stability, economic development, and national unity while portraying opposition movements as foreign-backed or subversive [8]. In Vladimir Putin's Russia, state television channels such as Russia Today (RT) and Channel One present carefully curated narratives that portray Western democracies as chaotic and morally bankrupt while positioning Russia as a defender of traditional values and stability [7, p. 10]. This framing discourages public support for democratic alternatives by making them appear risky and undesirable. In Saudi Arabia, government-controlled media promotes a political culture centered on loyalty to the monarchy. By framing the Saudi royal family as the guardian of Islam and national identity, the state ensures that political dissent is equated with religious and cultural betrayal. Social media platforms, though initially perceived as avenues for dissent, have increasingly come under state surveillance, further consolidating government control over political discourse. China's "Great Firewall" is another example of media control as a means of political socialization. By censoring politically sensitive topics, banning foreign news sources, and using artificial intelligence to monitor online discussions, the CCP limits citizens' exposure to alternative viewpoints. The result is a political culture where criticism of the government is either avoided or framed within state-approved narratives [1].

Rituals, Symbols, and Political Socialization

Beyond education and media, political rituals and symbols serve as powerful mechanisms of socialization in non-democratic regimes. Public ceremonies, national holidays, and mass mobilization events reinforce state legitimacy by fostering a collective political identity. In China, events such as National Day parades and the annual sessions of the National People's Congress serve to project an image of unity and stability. Citizens are expected to participate in state-sponsored activities that demonstrate allegiance to the Communist Party, reinforcing a sense of shared destiny under its leadership. Similarly, in Iran, annual events such as the anniversary of the 1979 Islamic Revolution and anti-American demonstrations are carefully orchestrated to socialize citizens into a political culture that equates loyalty to the regime with patriotism. State-controlled religious institutions further reinforce this political iden-

tity by merging religious faith with political obedience. In North Korea, mass gymnastics performances, military parades, and synchronized celebrations function as both displays of state power and exercises in collective political socialization. These rituals serve to create an environment where individual identity is subsumed within the collective national ideology.

Resistance, Adaptation, and the Evolution of Political Culture. Political culture, as a deeply embedded set of attitudes, norms, and values that shape political behavior, does not remain static, even under authoritarian rule. While non-democratic regimes strive to control political culture through mechanisms such as ideological indoctrination, repression, and controlled political socialization, societies often develop strategies of resistance and adaptation. Over time, these processes can lead to gradual or sudden shifts in political culture, influencing regime stability and the potential for democratization.

Political culture, as conceptualized by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba (1963), provides a framework for understanding how citizens engage with political authority. In their model, political cultures are categorized into parochial, subject, and participant cultures. Non-democratic regimes seek to cultivate a subject political culture in which individuals passively accept authority. However, political culture is not immutable—it evolves in response to socio-economic changes, technological advancements, and shifts in global political norms. Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony (1971) further explains how authoritarian regimes maintain power through cultural and ideological dominance rather than direct coercion alone. However, counter-hegemonic forces emerge as societies develop alternative narratives, challenging the state's legitimacy. James C. Scott's concept of "hidden transcripts" (1990) also provides insight into how resistance manifests in non-democratic settings, where subversive discourses and covert acts of defiance occur beneath the surface of apparent compliance.

Resistance: Forms and Mechanisms in Authoritarian Contexts

Resistance to authoritarian political culture does not always take the form of direct confrontation. Instead, it often emerges through subtle, dispersed, and indirect methods that challenge the regime's ideological control. These mechanisms of resistance include underground political movements, counter-narratives in art and literature, and the use of digital media to circumvent state propaganda. One of the most prominent forms of resistance is the creation of counter-publics, alternative spaces where dissenting ideas circulate outside state control. The role of *samizdat* (underground press) in the Soviet Union during the late 20th century is a clear example. Despite state censorship, dissidents circulated unofficial literature, exposing corruption, human rights violations, and alternative political ideologies [12]. These texts played a crucial role in

shaping a political culture that ultimately contributed to the decline of Soviet authority.

Digital technology has provided new avenues for resistance in contemporary authoritarian regimes. In China, despite the government's extensive control over the internet, activists and citizens have developed innovative ways to bypass censorship, such as using homophones and coded language to discuss politically sensitive topics. The 2019 anti-extradition bill protests in Hong Kong demonstrated the power of digital mobilization, where encrypted messaging apps and decentralized organizing strategies enabled sustained resistance against state repression.

Another form of resistance is cultural subversion, where art, music, and satire serve as vehicles for political critique. In Iran, underground music and banned literature have been used to challenge state-imposed religious and ideological norms. Similarly, in Belarus, opposition movements have utilized protest symbols, such as the white-red-white flag, to express defiance against Alexander Lukashenko's authoritarian rule.

Adaptation: Navigating and Negotiating Authoritarian Rule

Not all responses to authoritarian rule involve overt resistance. Many societies develop adaptive strategies that allow individuals to function within an oppressive political environment while subtly altering political culture over time. Adaptation involves the negotiation of political realities, where citizens find ways to express agency without directly confronting the regime. One form of adaptation is "loyalty signaling," where individuals outwardly conform to state ideology while privately holding alternative beliefs. This phenomenon has been observed in countries such as North Korea, where citizens publicly display loyalty to the regime while secretly consuming foreign media, such as South Korean television dramas. Over time, this exposure to alternative cultural influences contributes to shifts in political consciousness [4].

Institutional adaptation is another mechanism through which political culture evolves under non-democratic rule. Some authoritarian regimes tolerate controlled political participation to maintain stability while mitigating outright dissent. For example, in Singapore, the People's Action Party (PAP) allows limited political opposition and civil society engagement, creating an illusion of pluralism while maintaining strict control over political life. This managed form of political participation shapes a political culture where citizens engage within constrained parameters rather than openly challenging the regime. Similarly, in Russia, the Kremlin has adapted to public dissatisfaction by co-opting nationalist rhetoric and selectively allowing political debates that reinforce state narratives. By manipulating electoral processes and controlling opposition parties, the regime ensures that political culture remains within manageable limits, preventing mass mobilization against the state.

Economic pragmatism is another adaptive strategy. In China, the Communist Party has sustained its legitimacy by prioritizing economic development and improving living standards. The implicit social contract between the state and citizens, economic prosperity in exchange for political compliance, has shaped a political culture where economic security often takes precedence over demands for democratic governance.

The Evolution of Political Culture: Long-Term Shifts in Non-Democratic Regimes

Despite the state's efforts to control political culture, resistance and adaptation contribute to its long-term evolution. As societies undergo economic, technological, and generational changes, political values shift, often in ways that challenge the foundations of authoritarian rule. Generational change is a significant driver of political cultural evolution. Younger generations, exposed to global political norms and digital communication, often develop political attitudes that diverge from those of their predecessors. In post-Soviet states, for example, younger populations tend to be more politically active and critical of authoritarian legacies compared to older generations who lived under Soviet rule [11]. The 2020 pro-democracy protests in Belarus were largely driven by young activists who had grown up with access to alternative sources of information and international perspectives.

Economic transformations also contribute to shifts in political culture. The rise of the middle class in authoritarian states has historically been linked to increased demands for political rights. The 1980s democratic transitions in South Korea and Taiwan illustrate how economic modernization can lead to the erosion of authoritarian legitimacy, as middle-class citizens begin to advocate for greater political participation.

Technological advancements further accelerate political cultural change. The spread of the internet and social media has made it increasingly difficult for authoritarian regimes to maintain total control over information. Even in heavily censored environments, such as China and Iran, alternative political discourses emerge through digital platforms, gradually reshaping public attitudes toward governance and authority.

In general, the evolution of political culture in non-democratic regimes is shaped by a dynamic interplay of resistance and adaptation. While authoritarian states attempt to maintain control through ideological dominance, coercion, and managed participation, societies develop mechanisms to challenge, navigate, and gradually alter these structures. Political theory, from Gramsci's hegemony to Scott's hidden transcripts, provides insight into how resistance manifests in everyday life, while real-world examples from China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Belarus illustrate the diverse strategies through which political culture evolves. Although non-democratic regimes often appear stable, they are constantly engaged in a struggle to maintain legitimacy in the face of shift-

ing social dynamics. Over time, economic change, generational shifts, and technological advancements create cracks in the foundations of authoritarian rule. While the trajectory of political cultural evolution is unpredictable, history suggests that no regime can indefinitely suppress the adaptive and resistant forces that drive political transformation.

Conclusion. This study demonstrates that political culture in non-democratic regimes is neither static nor solely determined by state authority; rather, it is shaped through a complex interaction of ideological control, institutional reinforcement, coercion, and societal resistance. The findings indicate that while authoritarian regimes effectively manipulate political socialization mechanisms—such as state-controlled education, propaganda, and censorship—to instill obedience and legitimacy, these efforts are never absolute. The empirical evidence from China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Belarus shows that authoritarian political cultures persist through a combination of enforced loyalty, self-censorship, and restricted political participation. However, despite these control mechanisms, resistance emerges in various forms, including underground political movements, digital activism, and cultural subversion, which gradually alter political attitudes within these societies.

A key result of this study is that adaptation plays a crucial role in political cultural evolution under authoritarianism. Unlike direct resistance, adaptive strategies, such as outward compliance paired with private dissent, selective engagement in controlled political spaces, and economic pragmatism, allow citizens to navigate oppressive political systems while gradually shifting underlying political attitudes. This adaptation process, observed in countries like Singapore and post-Soviet states, suggests that even within tightly controlled environments, political cultures evolve due to generational change, exposure to alternative discourses, and technological advancements that challenge state narratives.

Furthermore, this study finds that authoritarian regimes' reliance on coercion, particularly surveillance and repression, has paradoxical effects: while it enforces short-term compliance, it also contributes to long-term instability by fostering latent opposition and deepening distrust between the state and society. The case of Belarus illustrates that excessive repression can backfire, generating a cycle of political crises that erode the very legitimacy authoritarian regimes seek to sustain. Similarly, Russia's increasing reliance on coercion in the wake of declining ideological control highlights the limitations of authoritarian adaptability in the face of societal change.

Thus, the logical conclusion of this research is that political culture in non-democratic regimes is an evolving battleground where authority seeks to dominate, but societal agency continuously reconfigures the boundaries of political engagement. The

durability of authoritarian regimes depends not only on their ability to enforce political obedience but also on their capacity to manage socio-political change. As economic shifts, digital connectivity, and generational transformation accelerate, the political cultures of non-democratic states will increasingly be shaped by the tension between control and contestation. Ultimately, the findings suggest that while authoritarian regimes may persist through adaptation, no system can indefinitely suppress the structural forces that drive political cultural transformation.

REFERENCES:

1. Brown, S. A. W. (2024). Beyond the great firewall: EU and US responses to the China challenge in the global digital economy. *Journal of European Integration*, 46(7), 1089–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2024.2402752> [in English]
2. Butler, J. C. (2013). Authoritarianism and fear responses to pictures: The role of social differences. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(1), 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.698392> [in English]
3. Cabarov, C. (2021). Siyasi propaqanda texnologiyaları. *Elm və İnnovativ Texnologiyalar Jurnalı*, 17, 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.30546/2616-4418.17.2021.94> [in Azerbaijani]
4. Dukalskis, A., & Katzeff, S. B. (2024). Evaluating everyday politics in North Korea. *Asian Studies Review*, 48(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2024.2312140> [in English]
5. Ellul, J. (1965). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. [in English]
6. Fu, K. W. (2023). Propagandization of relative gratification: How Chinese state media portray the international pandemic. *Political Communication*, 40(6), 788–809. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2023.2207492> [in English]
7. Jabarov, J. (2021). Türkiye global aktörlerin propaganda savaşında. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Student Science Congress* (p. 10). Ankara: YTB. [in Turkish]
8. Jabarov, J. (2022). Sociological propaganda: From Jacques Ellul to the present. In *Proceedings of the İstanbul International Modern Scientific Research Congress – IV* (pp. 231–242). İstanbul: İKSAD. ISBN: 978-625-6404-15-1 [in English]
9. Jabarov, J. (2023). Cultural relativism theory and Azerbaijan democracy. *International Journal of Multiculturalism*, 4(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.30546/2523-4331.2023.4.1.25> [in English]
10. Jabarov, J. (2025). Propagandanın toplumsal mühendislikte rolü: Çin'in sosyal kredi sistemine ilişkin vaka çalışması. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Mediterranean Congress* (pp. 1152–1168). Valencia, Spain. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.28323086> [in Turkish]
11. Nisnevich, Y., & Ryabov, A. (2020). Post-Soviet authoritarianism. *Russian Social Science Review*, 61(6), 538–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611428.2020.1852042> [in English]
12. Podrabinek, A. (1990). Does the Soviet press have a future? *Index on Censorship*, 19(8), 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03064229008534912> [in English]

Вплив влади на політичну культуру в недемократичних режимах

Деніз Валієва Фікрат

аспірантка кафедри дипломатії
та сучасних інтеграційних процесів
Бакинського державного університету
вул. Академіка Західа Халілова, 23,
Баку, Азербайджан
ORCID: 0009-0007-7095-7149

Це дослідження розглядає багатогранний вплив влади на політичну культуру в недемократичних режимах, зосереджуючись на тому, як ідеологічний контроль, політична соціалізація та репресивні механізми формують суспільні погляди та поведінку. Спираючись на теоретичні уявлення Антоніо Грамші про гегемонію, концепцію ідеологічних державних апаратів Луї Альтюссера та теорію прихованих транскриптів Джеймса С. Скотта, дослідження аналізує, як авторитарні режими маніпулюють культурними та політичними нормами для підтримання легітимності та придушення інакодумства. Основна мета полягає у вивченні того, як такі режими, попри різноманіття історичних та географічних контекстів, застосовують подібні стратегії – від контрольованої державою освіти й пропаганди у ЗМІ до тотального нагляду та цілеспрямованих репресій – задля зміцнення лояльності та запобігання політичному плюралізму.

На основі порівняльного аналізу таких країн, як Китай, Росія, Північна Корея, Іран і Білорусь, дослідження виявляє як сталі риси, так і адаптаційні елементи в авторитарному управлінні. Методологічно робота поєднує якісний аналіз документів із порівняльною політичною соціологією, досліджуючи як першоджерела (державні політики, зміст медіа), так і наукову літературу. Було ідентифіковано, як пропагандистські кампанії, освітні програми, інституціоналізовані ритуали та контрольоване громадянське залучення сприяють підтримці наративів режиму, водночас маргіналізуючи опозицію.

Також розглядається парадокс: надмірна репресія, хоч і забезпечує короточасну покору, у довгостроковій перспективі може підривати стабільність, викликаючи прихований опір і зниження довіри до влади.

Результати дослідження свідчать, що політична культура в авторитарних умовах не є статичною, а є динамічною сферою протистояння, де суспільна активність зберігається попри зовнішню покору. Адаптивні стратегії – такі як вибіркова участь, приватне інакомислення, цифровий активізм та культурна субверсія – поступово трансформують політичні норми, кидаючи виклик гегемонним наративам правлячої еліти. У висновку зазначено, що хоча недемократичні режими можуть пристосовуватися до змін у соціально-політичному середовищі, структурні чинники – такі як економічна модернізація, технологічний прогрес та зміна поколінь – неминуче змінюють політичну культуру з часом.

Ключові слова: авторитаризм, політична культура, політична соціалізація, опір, ідеологічний контроль.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 23.08.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 15.09.2025

Дата публікації: 10.10.2025