

SUMMARIES

The Changing Times: World War II and the Changing Protagonists of Great Power Competition **Liu Debin**

Continuous wars and the rise and fall of great powers have constituted the main theme of the development and changes of international relations since modern times. Unlike previous wars, World War II not only ended the world dominance of European powers and promoted the rise of the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, but also created a historic opportunity for the rise of the decolonization movement and the rise of non – Western powers. The loss of the world dominance of European powers began as early as the “brotherly feud” of World War I, and World War II paved the way for the rise of the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union. The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union was not only a continuation of the hegemony of great powers in modern times, but also spread the competition between the two development models and the game between the two camps to the whole world, which had an important impact on the development and changes of the post – war world. It was in the ups and downs of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union that the decolonization movement flourished and the Third World quietly took shape; The new China established in the victory of the Chinese People’s War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression and the War of Liberation broke through the constraints of the US – Soviet Cold War system, took the lead in opening up the reform and opening – up process, and achieved leapfrog development in the process of integrating into the world economic system. Together with non – Western powers such as India and Russia that “transformed” after the Cold War, it rose to become the protagonist on the world stage. In the eighty years after the war, the world not only witnessed the fall of the dominant position of Europe and Western powers, but also witnessed the rise of non – Western powers and the beginning of the rebalancing process of world history since modern times. This may be the most important historical significance of World War II.

Key Words: World War II, European Powers, Competition of Great Powers, US – Soviet Cold War, Rise of Non – Western Powers

The Evolution of Russian World War II History Research after the Collapse of the Soviet Union **Liu Xianzhong**

World War II had an important impact on the historical process of Russia. The study

of World War II and the Soviet Patriotic War has been highly valued both in the Soviet period and in Russia, the successor of the Soviet Union. Before the disintegration of the Soviet Union, this issue had always been within the scope of concern of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It was an integral part of the party's propaganda and a tool for ideological struggle. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, in order to reshape the historical view of the World War II, the Russian government organized domestic experts to compile two basic and large-scale works on the Great Patriotic War. In addition to the works completed by the Russian official organization, some archives departments in Russia also edited and published a large number of archival document collections after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Based on the newly published materials, the Russian academic community has formed a large number of new research results on World War II and the Great Patriotic War. Although the Russian academic community has reached a certain consensus on specific issues such as the "Soviet-German Non-Aggression Treaty", the beginning of World War II, and the population loss in the Great Patriotic War, there are still academic differences in some aspects. The Soviet Union has clearer data on personnel losses in the war against Japan. Sino-Soviet cooperation in the fight against Japanese aggression during the War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression has always been the focus of Russian experts studying China. There are always achievements in this regard at important time nodes. In recent years, while studying the issue of aid to China, Russian scholars have also begun to pay attention to the impact of the Chinese battlefield on other battlefields during World War II, which was rare in the past. The reshaping of the historical view of World War II during the Putin period is not a simple return to the Soviet historical view. It is limited and has the characteristics of the times.

Key Words: World War II, Great Patriotic War, World Anti-Fascist War, Historical Narrative, Russian Historical Memory

Shaping National Economic Resilience amid Geopolitical Conflict: Case Study on Russia based on the "Double Diamond Model"

Song Shuang, Lü Jing

Against the backdrop of frequent international geopolitical conflicts, many countries have significantly increased their attention to economic security and have placed more emphasis on national economic resilience. This article proposes a "double diamond model" for national economic resilience at the strategic level, covering two relevant dimensions: static and dynamic. The former refers to the ability of the national economic system to mitigate shocks under normal circumstances. The shaping of this inherent ability needs to rely on the country's own economic conditions. In the medium and long term, the government improves the country's economic resilience by

improving the country's conditions in production factors, market demand, supporting industries and corporate competition; the latter refers to the government's ability to restore economic stability and achieve adaptive development in a short period of time by quickly introducing monetary and financial policies, consumption policies, investment policies and trade policies under geopolitical shocks. The national economic resilience built through medium-term and long-term strategies can provide support for the government's rapid policy response under the impact of geopolitical conflicts. Since 2014, Russia has shaped its national economic resilience through medium-term and long-term strategies based on national basic conditions. Under the impact of the current round of sanctions caused by Russia-Ukraine conflict, Russian government has actively and decisively tried to shape the ability to recover and adapt quickly through direct economic intervention policies, supporting the good economic performance since Russia-Ukraine conflict. This verifies the theoretical mechanism explained by the double diamond model. However, the shaping of national economic resilience is a complex system engineering. The economic resilience paradox may arise in the process of shaping economic resilience. From the perspective of long-term development, Russia also needs to solve this problem.

Key Words: Economic Resilience, Economic Security, Double Diamond Model, Russian Economic Policy, Resilience Paradox

From Financial Security to Financial Sovereignty: The Logic and Practice of Russia's Adjustment of Financial Policies **Ding Chao, Ding Yibo**

With the development of financial globalization and the intensification of competition among major powers, financial sovereignty has increasingly become a focal issue of concern to countries around the world. The issue of financial sovereignty involves sovereign states ceding some financial power to supranational economic organizations. For developing countries or emerging economies, it involves giving up some sovereignty in order to integrate into the process of economic integration. Russia's attention to financial sovereignty began with the Crimean crisis in 2014, but it started large-scale financial sovereignty construction after the outbreak of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in 2022. The sanctions imposed by the United States and Europe have highlighted the fragility of Russia's finance and have caused a substantial impact on Russia's financial sovereignty, forcing it to consider restructuring its monetary and financial system. In Russia's policy logic, maintaining financial security is an unquestionable long-term task, while defending financial sovereignty is a higher strategic goal given by the times under severe sanctions. Russia's policy upgrade from financial security to financial sovereignty, on the one hand, reflects Russia's unique understanding of financial sovereignty. In a general sense, "Ceding part of sovereignty to supranational economic

organizations” or “giving up part of sovereignty in order to integrate into the integration process” is not realistic in the Russian context, and Russia does not believe that these two situations will threaten its financial sovereignty. On the other hand, it also reflects Russia’s different understanding of security and sovereignty, that is, when facing security threats, it can focus on changing itself to adapt to the environment, but when sovereignty is threatened, it must change the rules of the game, while reconstructing the domestic monetary and financial system, and uniting friendly countries to reconstruct the international monetary and financial system. At present, although Russia has made systematic policy arrangements, there is limited room for breakthroughs in the short term.

Key Words: Russian Finance, Financial Sovereignty, Financial Security, Financial Sanctions, Financial Policy

Binary Structure and Dual Logic: Russia’s Turn to the East from the Perspective of Spatial Economy

Zhao Haiwen

After the outbreak of Russia–Ukraine conflict, Russia accelerated its turn to the East, and the Far East was identified as the focus of Russia’s economic development. However, by comparing the economic data of the Russian Far Eastern Federal District and the Central Federal District in the past two years, it was found that there was a counterintuitive deviation and spatial differentiation between fixed capital investment and manufacturing production. Is the turn to the East really, as Russian scholars say, both an external economic turn to the Asia–Pacific region and an internal economic turn to the Far East? This article starts from the perspective of spatial economy and divides the Russian economy into two interrelated systems, “domestic economy” and “international regional economy”, according to the “one body, two sides” framework. It conducts a process analysis of Russia’s spatial economy from both internal and external aspects. First, after a long period of “circular cumulative causality” development, Russia’s domestic economy has formed a stable spatial dual structure, namely “Western manufacturing–Eastern fuel base” and “Western economic center–Eastern economic periphery”. Secondly, affected by the spatial binary structure, Russia follows different logics in participating in regional economic cooperation between countries. The western region participates in regional economic cooperation according to the market logic, while the eastern region participates in regional economic cooperation according to the security logic. Under the spatial binary structure of domestic economic layout and the dual logic of international regional economic cooperation, although the impact of sanctions has promoted Russia’s foreign economy to turn to the East, the domestic economy has not turned to the East. It is this spatial dislocation between domestic and foreign economic development that has led to counterintuitive deviations

and spatial differentiation in fixed capital investment and manufacturing production in Russia.

Key Words: Russian Economic Geography, Geo – economics, Spatial Binary Structure, Russia’s Turn to the East, International Economic Cooperation

National Information Warfare in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Taking the US – Russia Information Warfare as an Example **Yang Nan**

Information warfare follows the strategic logic of “mechanism – technology – content”, that is, the initiator’s bureaucracy plans and prepares to shape a specific narrative, and the shaped information continues to spread in the region through specific communication technologies, and influences the audience through adaptive content in order to obtain strategic benefits. Artificial intelligence, as a disruptive technology, provides the prerequisite for the country to empower information warfare. It is also regarded by the strategic circles of various countries as a way to improve the decision-making quality of planning agencies, expand the scale of battlefields, and change the way information is disseminated and produced. Competition and game are the background of the bilateral relationship between the US and Russia, and information warfare is an important form of interaction between the two sides. The US and Russian governments both attach great importance to the importance of information warfare. For this reason, they have been committed to building long-term mechanisms, introducing emerging technologies, and optimizing propaganda strategies since the Cold War, in order to weaken the strategic advantages of the other side. With the development of artificial intelligence technology, US and Russia continue to promote the integration of this technology into all aspects of information warfare based on their own political systems and scientific research ecological environment characteristics. In the coming era of artificial intelligence, the global “information weaponization” trend will continue to deepen and become more difficult to govern. Faced with the “post-truth era” caused by normalized information warfare, China should make systematic strategic planning from multiple levels such as government, society, communication subjects and the international community to resolve related risks. This article uses the US – Russia information warfare as a case study to analyze the impact of artificial intelligence on information warfare between countries, which will help deepen the understanding of information warfare among major powers in the era of artificial intelligence and ensure that China can take the initiative in international public opinion, defend national security and maintain social stability in the great changes that have not been seen in a century.

Key Words: Information Warfare, Cognitive Warfare, Artificial Intelligence, Cybersecurity, US–Russian Relations

German–Russian Relations and Changes in the European Security Order

Huang Mengmeng

Germany has a special role in Europe's strategy toward Russia. The benign interaction between Germany and Russia after the Cold War is an important factor in maintaining a cooperative European security order. Against the backdrop of the Russia–Ukraine conflict, the qualitative change in German–Russian relations and the disintegration of the cooperative European security order have co-evolved, which is mainly reflected in three aspects. First, within the geopolitical boundaries of the European security order, Germany actively shapes the EU's "geopolitical power", fronttaking into account Russia's geopolitical and security interests after the Cold War to supporting Europe and Russia in geopolitical spheres of influence competition in the Western Balkans. Second, the elements of the European cooperative order from the German perspective have disintegrated, including the collapse of the European–Russian regional security mechanism, Germany's abandonment of the "business–driven change" strategy toward Russia, and the loss of the social foundation of the cooperative European security order. Third, Germany and Russia have tended to have opposing perceptions of the United States' influence on European security. In Russia–Ukraine conflict, Germany regards the United States' security guarantee for Europe as the core issue of the transatlantic alliance. Even during the Trump 2.0 period, when the United States and Russia bypassed EU to start bilateral negotiations on Russia–Ukraine issue, Germany was still committed to persuading the United States to continue its security guarantee for Europe, supporting EU's position of "assisting Ukraine against Russia", and promising to strengthen the construction of the "European pillar" within NATO. This is in serious conflict with Russia's demand to "stand on an equal footing" with Western countries to jointly shape the European security order. Germany's role as a mediator between the East and the West and political mutual trust between Germany and Russia disappeared. However, in addition to German–Russian relations, the European security order is also affected by factors such as the shift in US foreign policy during the Trump period, internal challenges within Germany and EU. For this reason, the direction of the European security order is still a contest of power games among all parties.

Key Words: European Security Order, German–Russian Relations, EU Geopolitics, Trump 2.0, Russia–Ukraine Conflict