

Original article

УДК 070

EDN GMLEVR

DOI 10.17150/2308-6203.2025.14(1).34-45



Promoting a Correct View of World War II History and Safeguarding International Order: Logic and Path

Zhang Luzhou 

Communication University of China, Beijing, People's Republic of China,
colin422@126.com

Abstract. On May 16, 2024, China and Russia jointly issued the “Joint Statement of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation on Deepening the Comprehensive Strategic Partnership of Coordination in the New Era on the Occasion of the 75th Anniversary of the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the Two Countries”, which clearly emphasizes the need to “jointly promote a correct view of World War II history”. The “view of World War II history” encompasses a multi-level understanding of the war, which is one of the key factors influencing national policies and public perceptions in contemporary international relations practice. In recent years, the post-war world order and the correct view of World War II history are being impacted and deconstructed. It is urgent to construct effective ways to promote and disseminate the correct view of World War II history, support the global governance concept of “co-governance, co-construction, and sharing”, practice true multilateralism.

Keywords. World War II perspective, international order, strategic dialogue, ritualized expression, history education.

Article info. Received December 23, 2024; revised February 14, 2025; accepted February 17, 2025; available online March 31, 2025.

For Citation. Zhang Luzhou. Promoting a Correct View of World War II History and Safeguarding International Order: Logic and Path. *Voprosy teorii i praktiki zhurnalistiki = Theoretical and Practical Issues of Journalism*, 2025, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 34–45. EDN: GMLEVR. DOI: 10.17150/2308-6203.2025.14(1).34-45.

Научная статья

Продвижение правильного восприятия истории Второй мировой войны и защита международного порядка: логика и путь

Чжан Лучжоу 

Китайский университет коммуникаций, Пекин, Китайская Народная Республика,
colin422@126.com

Аннотация. «Перспектива Второй мировой войны» относится к общему отношению и взглядам людей на историческое понимание, интерпретацию и оценку Второй мировой войны. Это не статичное или единое понятие, а динамичное, открытое и спорное поле для дебатов. Ее содержание и выражение варьируются в зависимости от разных исторических периодов, стран и идеоло-

гий. Определение «перспективы Второй мировой войны» часто тесно связано с современной национальной политикой и международными отношениями. История — это не просто простое повествование о прошлом, но и точка пересечения власти, памяти и идентичности. Поэтому различные страны, группы и даже отдельные личности формируют разные перспективы Второй мировой войны, исходя из своих собственных интересов, ценностей и исторической памяти. Это не только важное направление исследования в истории, но и ключевой фактор, влияющий на национальную политику и общественные восприятия в современной практике международных отношений.

Исследуя исторические архивы, данная статья утверждает, что правильная перспектива Второй мировой войны закладывает прочную основу для построения послевоенной глобальной системы управления. Она не только помогает победившим странам формировать национальную идентичность, но и позволяет им занимать инициативу во внешней политике во время международных обменов. Например, в диалоге между правительствами Китая и Японии перспектива Второй мировой войны часто используется как основа, подчеркивая агрессивное поведение Японии во время войны и выделяя законные права Китая как победившей страны в отношениях с Японией. 21 мая 2024 г. представитель Министерства иностранных дел Китая опубликовал в социальных сетях статью 8 «Потсдамской декларации», ссылаясь на провокационные действия Японии по Тайваньскому вопросу и намекая на то, что Китай по-прежнему сохраняет права и интересы победившей страны во Второй мировой войне. Это показывает, что напоминание об истории важно не только для поддержания точности исторической памяти, но и для получения политических преимуществ в современных международных отношениях.

Статья также исследует конкретные практики и последствия «исторического ревизионизма» и «стратегического фальсифицирования истории» для формирования «перспективы Второй мировой войны». Определение «перспективы Второй мировой войны» различными суверенными государствами не только формирует межгосударственные отношения и выработку внешней политики, но и оказывает влияние на поддержание и корректировку международного порядка в практическом плане. Для стран в нынешнюю эпоху «VUCA» это создает дилемму задержавшейся глобализации и сопровождающиеся ею риски войны и растущая неопределенность в развитии. С точки зрения исторической логики, перспектива Второй мировой войны затрагивает не только исход войны, но и включает глубокие размышления о морали и ответственности войны, подчеркивая тяжелые катастрофы, которые фашизм и милитаризм принесли всему человечеству. С практической точки зрения, поддержание правильной перспективы Второй мировой войны — это не только задача историков, но и коллективная ответственность международного сообщества. В этом контексте статья указывает, что поддержание послевоенной системы через постоянный стратегический диалог и обмены между основными странами имеет решающее значение. Это способствует распространению ценностей и образования, связанного с правильной перспективой Второй мировой войны, защищая тем самым существующую послевоенную систему международных отношений. Это связано с продолжением глобальной справедливости и мира, многополяризацией мира, демократизацией международных отношений и развитием более справедливой и разумной системы глобального управления.

Ключевые слова. Перспектива Второй мировой войны, международный порядок, стратегический диалог, ритуализированное выражение, историческое образование.

Информация о статье. Дата поступления 23 декабря 2024 г.; дата поступления после доработки 14 февраля 2025 г.; дата принятия к печати 17 февраля 2025 г.; дата онлайн-размещения 31 марта 2025 г.

Для цитирования. Чжан Лучжоу. Продвижение правильного восприятия истории Второй мировой войны и защита международного порядка: логика и путь / Чжан Лучжоу. — DOI 10.17150/2308-6203.2025.14(1).34-45. — EDN GMLEVR // Вопросы теории и практики журналистики. — 2025. — Т. 14, № 1. — С. 34–45.

Introduction

The “World War II perspective” refers to the overall attitude and perspective people hold towards the historical understanding, interpretation, and evaluation of the Second World War. It is not a static or unified concept, but rather a dynamic, open, and controversial field of debate. Its content and expression vary across different periods, countries, and ideologies. The definition of the “World War II perspective” is often closely related to contemporary national politics and international relations. History is not merely a simple narrative of the past, but also a convergence of power, memory, and identity. Therefore, different countries, groups, and even individuals construct different World War II perspectives based on their own interests, values, and historical memories. This is not only an important research direction in history, but also a key factor influencing national policies and public perceptions in contemporary international relations practice. Through the research, this article posits that a correct perspective on World War II lays a solid foundation for the construction of the post-war global governance system. It not only aids victorious countries in constructing national identity but also helps them seize the initiative in foreign policy during international exchanges. For instance, in the government-to-government dialogue between China and Japan, the perspective on World War II is often used as a basis, emphasizing Japan's aggressive behavior during the war and highlighting China's legal rights against Japan as a victorious country. This article also examines the specific practices and impacts of “historical revisionism” and “strategic historical falsification” on the construction of

the “World War II perspective”. The definition of the “World War II perspective” by different sovereign countries not only shapes inter-state relations and the formulation of foreign policies but also affects the maintenance and adjustment of the international order in practice. For countries in the current “VUCA” era, this poses a dilemma of delayed globalization and the accompanying risks of war and growing uncertainty in development. From a historical logic perspective, the World War II perspective not only involves the outcome of the war but also encompasses profound reflections on the morality and responsibility of war, highlighting the severe disasters brought by fascism and militarism to all mankind. From a practical perspective, maintaining a correct World War II perspective is not only the task of historians but also the collective responsibility of the international community. In light of this, this article points out in its research that maintaining the post-war system through continuous strategic dialogue and exchanges among major countries is crucial. It promotes the dissemination of values and education related to a correct World War II perspective, thereby defending the existing post-war international relations system. This is related to the continuous continuation of global justice and peace, the multipolarization of the world, the democratization of international relations, and the development of a more just and reasonable global governance system.

Literature Review

The Constructivist Paradigm advocates that social reality is constructed through social interaction and cultural transmission, emphasizing the role of individuals

and collectives in shaping historical and political memories. Its core viewpoint holds that relations between countries, political power, and historical memory are not determined by certain fixed external facts, but are constantly changing and reconstructing through the process of social construction [1, p. 110–122]. Currently, the definition of “World War II perspective” by different sovereign states shapes inter-state relations and the formulation of foreign policies, and even in fact affects the maintenance and adjustment of the international order. With changes in the global political environment, the “World War II perspective” plays an important role in national identity, international cooperation and confrontation, global governance, and other aspects. This study will rely on social constructivist theory to analyze the formation of historical perspectives on World War II and their interaction with international political cognition.

Benedict Anderson, an Irish social anthropologist, pointed out that “national identity is often constructed through shared memories of historical events, especially through war memories to enhance national pride and a sense of belonging” [2, p. 282–288]. Under the framework of constructivism, historical memory and international relations are viewed as dynamic and constantly evolving processes of construction [3, pp. 77–85]. This theoretical perspective emphasizes how nations and groups construct collective cognition of historical events through rituals, education, and public memory, thereby influencing their foreign policies and international stances [4]. The perspective on World War II history is not merely an objective review of past events, but rather a historical representation by nations within specific social and political contexts. To apply this theory, this study adopts an analytical approach focusing on social construction processes, particularly in analyzing how different nations narrate the history of World War II. It pays attention to how nations construct and dis-

seminate historical memory through policies, education, media, and other means. Through this analytical framework, this study will delve into how nations shape their national identity and pursue political interests on the international stage through specific historical narratives.

For victorious countries such as China, Russia, and the United States, the historical narrative of World War II directly influences their national identity and international positioning. In its historical narrative, China regards the comprehensive victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan as an important starting point for national independence and liberation. This not only enabled China to shake off the passive image of “the sick man of East Asia” and reestablish its national self-esteem and international status, but also constructed a collective identity centered on national pride and national rejuvenation through comprehensive memory and complete promotion of the history of the War of Resistance Against Japan. This is not only a connection with the global anti Fascist struggle, but also a historical contribution to the establishment of the post-war order represented by the United Nations system. The Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression is a just war against aggression. “It has significantly improved China's international status and influence, made the Chinese people win the respect of peace loving people in the world, and the Chinese nation has won a high national reputation”¹. Russia refers to World War II as the “Great Patriotic War”, deeply integrating its historical perspective with its national spirit. The Soviet Union's victory in World War II was not merely a military triumph but also a significant testament to the country's righteousness. Through historical narratives, the Soviet Union solidified its international status during the

¹ One Hundred Years of the CPC: The New Democratic Revolution Period / Central Party History and Literature Research Institute. Beijing, CPC History Press, 2022. 259 p.

Cold War [5, p. 43–71], and the contemporary Russian government has inherited this “World War II historical perspective”, using it to reinforce national legitimacy and ethnic unity. Every year on May 9th, Russia holds a grand military parade in Moscow to commemorate the victory of the Patriotic War. This underscores the importance and “ritualized” expression of victory, which remains a central aspect in the study of Russia's political discourse on World War II history.

Currently, historical memory plays an increasingly prominent role in international relations, especially when dealing with historical issues. The “World War II historical perspective” has become one of the important references for countries' decision-making. In the intergovernmental dialogue between China and Japan, it is often used as a basis to emphasize Japan's aggressive behavior during World War II and to highlight China's legal rights against Japan as a victorious country. For instance, on May 21, 2024, Foreign Ministry spokesperson Chunying Hua posted Article 8 of the “Potsdam Proclamation” on social media regarding Japan's provocative actions on Taiwan-related issues: “The sovereignty of Japan shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and other small islands to be determined by us” [6]. This implies that China still retains the rights of a victorious country in World War II. Thus, reiterating history is not merely to maintain the accuracy of historical memory; it is also to gain political advantages in contemporary international relations. In Japan, historical revisionism has long existed among right-wing forces, especially the downplaying and denial of World War II crimes, leading to diplomatic tensions with neighboring countries. This so-called “revision” is not only a debate in the academic community but also directly affects foreign policies [7]. Whenever the Japanese government attempts to revise textbooks or visit the Yasukuni Shrine, it triggers strong reactions

from China and South Korea, leading to the deterioration of bilateral relations. Similarly, Russia also places great emphasis on the “World War II historical perspective” as a basis, emphasizing its role as a liberator in foreign policy and competing with NATO. Russia's World War II narrative has become an important means for it to respond to Western criticism and enhance its international status [8, p. 301–305].

After World War II, the global governance structure was gradually established around the United Nations system, and the “World War II historical perspective”, as the historical foundation of the international order, continues to influence the legitimacy and stability of global governance. The United Nations and its subsidiary agencies often use the historical lessons of World War II as a backdrop, advocating for maintaining global peace and security through multilateralism and international cooperation. As former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan pointed out, “The lessons of World War II are the foundation of global cooperation, and countries should maintain international order through a common memory of history” [9].

Research Method

This study primarily employs archival analysis as its core research methodology. Through systematic analysis of relevant academic literature, policy documents, and historical materials, it explores how different countries understand the history of World War II and its application in international relations. Given that research on “historical revisionism” and “strategies of politically motivated historical distortion” heavily relies on textual analysis, archival analysis serves as a crucial tool for this study. In conducting archival analysis, this study first conducts a comprehensive analysis of official historical documents issued by governments (such as government statements, records of commemorative activities), academic works, media reports,

and communiqués issued by international organizations. Content analysis is employed to systematically code these documents and extract core themes, keywords, and contexts related to the “historical perspective on World War II”. This analytical approach facilitates a deeper understanding of the formation process of historical narratives and the political intentions behind them.

Specifically, the research is conducted through the following steps: First, literature selection and screening involves choosing authoritative academic literature, official statements, and historical records related to World War II narratives, with a focus on historical memories and foreign policies involving China, Russia, Japan, the United States, and other countries. Second, coding and classification involves categorizing historical narratives in the literature, extracting key historical viewpoints and controversial points, especially those related to historical revisionism and war crimes. Based on the themes and presentation methods of the literature content, classification criteria are set and coding is carried out. Third, qualitative analysis involves further exploring the social and political backgrounds of various historical narratives, analyzing how these narratives are disseminated domestically and internationally through cultural and educational means, and subsequently influencing international society's perception of historical events.

Study Results

The value and significance

The value significance of a correct view of World War II history is that the post-war international order was constructed by the Charter of the United Nations and multilateral cooperation mechanisms, reflecting the historical victory over fascism and militarism. The establishment of the United Nations originated from the vision of the Anti Fascist Alliance for post-war international peace and security mechanisms, with the main purpose of avoiding war, resolv-

ing international disputes, and promoting international economic and social progress through multilateral cooperation. The establishment of the United Nations is not only a response to the failure of the League of Nations, but also a consensus gradually formed by the allies during the war process, that is, to maintain global peace through a more effective international organization [10]. Its core value lies in maintaining global peace and justice through multilateral cooperation and collective security mechanisms. Since the war fully exposed the serious threat of global disorder to world peace, it has become a global consensus that countries can engage in dialogue and negotiation through the United Nations platform, and avoid repeating the mistakes of World War II through the promulgation and implementation of international law. The United Nations system also lays the foundation for modern international law and the equality of state sovereignty, ensuring equal participation of countries in international affairs, and containing international conflicts that may lead to war through collective security mechanisms. A correct view of World War II history recognizes the United Nations system as the cornerstone of today's world security order. It is not only a historical account of the past, but also a consensus of the international community on post-war peace, security, and justice. In the context of the “unprecedented changes in the century”, the Russia-Ukraine conflict and the stalemate in the Palestine-Israel conflict are difficult to resolve. Some member states' neglect or even disregard for the authority of the United Nations occasionally occurs, highlighting the profound practical significance of maintaining the post-war international order and spreading a correct view of World War II history.

The diverse interpretations

Specifically, the diversity of views on World War II history can be summarized into the following different perspectives.

First, the perspective of the victorious countries. This perspective is represented by the United States, the Soviet Union (Russia), Britain, and China, which claim their leadership position and great contributions in the anti-fascist war. The victory of World War II was not only a military victory, but also a defense of human values and moral systems. After the war, the establishment of the United Nations and the Charter of the United Nations were seen as a continuation of this historical view. Second, the perspective of the defeated countries. Represented by Germany and Japan, the defeated countries gradually formed their own view of World War II history after the war, mainly through “reconstructing memory” and “washing away humiliation” to reshape their national image. Third, the perspective of the Cold War. The rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union created new rifts in the interpretation of World War II history between the Eastern and Western camps. The Soviet Union (and later Russia) regarded World War II as a “great patriotic war”, highlighting its decisive role on the European battlefield; Driven by Cold War ideologies, the United States downplays the contributions of the Soviet Union and emphasizes its victories in the Asia-Pacific region. This divergence is not only a historical debate but also a continuation of ideological struggles during the Cold War. Fourthly, there is a post-colonial perspective. For instance, India, which gained independence after World War II, combines the history of the war with the history of anti-colonial struggles, forming a unique perspective on World War II.

The communication dilemma

“Revisionist narrative”

As a foundational event of the modern international order, World War II has profoundly influenced modern international law, international relations, and the political and social structures of various countries. However, historical revisionists are attempt-

ing to rewrite past history to serve current political goals. Especially in the context of the rise of extremism, historical revisionism has become a powerful force that undermines the existing global political order and national identity. Specifically, there are three main manifestations: Firstly, the denial and downplaying of the aggressor's atrocities. Despite the detailed investigation and evidence supporting the historical facts of the Holocaust, revisionists still attempt to question the death toll in the concentration camps and even deny the existence of systematic extermination. Holocaust deniers attempt to undermine the recognition of the atrocities committed by the German Nazi regime and Japanese militarism during World War II by questioning the authenticity of historical evidence. American historian Deborah Lipstadt systematically refuted these revisionist views, pointing out that these actions are not only distortions of historical facts but also carry political purposes of reviving extreme nationalism [11]. Secondly, the beautification and glorification of the historical role of the aggressor country. Another major form of historical revisionism is to change the historical positioning of aggressive countries during World War II, especially Japan and Germany, by beautifying their roles. This type of revisionism often attempts to downplay or completely deny war crimes, claiming that these countries' military actions are in self-defense or in response to international pressure. In Japan, revisionists attempted to redefine their role in World War II by revising history textbooks and glorifying Japan's war behavior in East Asia. For example, Yasukuni Shrine, as an important war memorial site in Japan, enshrines several Class-A war criminals from World War II. Thirdly, the redefinition and division of war responsibility. In recent years, some extreme right-wing forces in Eastern European countries have attempted to reshape national history through this revisionist narrative, transforming the Soviet Union in World War II from a “liberator”

to an “oppressor”, downplaying German Nazi atrocities, and even viewing Nazis as a “smaller threat” [12, p. 313–352]. This revisionist narrative is not only a distortion of history, but also serves modern nationalism and anti-Russian sentiment politically. By denying atrocities, glorifying invading countries, and redefining war responsibility, historical revisionists attempt to change global historical memory to serve the current nationalist revival and geopolitical game. This trend not only triggers a competition for historical memory in domestic politics, but also undermines the stability of the global peace order through the competition for historical narratives in the international community.

The rise of extreme nationalism

The resurgence of extreme nationalism impacting the correct perspective on World War II is not accidental but has profound historical backgrounds and motivations, such as regional economic development imbalances under globalization, changes in national sovereignty demands brought about by instability in the global political order, cultural diversity, and the migration crisis. Against this backdrop, extreme nationalists attempt to reshape history, highlighting their country's role as a “victim”, and beautifying or downplaying aggression and atrocities during World War II. Taking Japan as an example, right-wing politicians attempt to strengthen the “victim image of the Japanese nation” by attributing Japan's defeat in World War II to the atomic bombings and postwar occupation by the United States, thereby downplaying Japan's war responsibility and providing legitimacy for extreme nationalism and militarism in Japan. In the United States, some extreme nationalists reinterpret the history of World War II, emphasizing the principles of “isolationism” and “self-defense”, downplaying the global responsibilities of the United States, and promoting the withdrawal of the United States from the multilateral cooperation framework. Some historians point out that these extreme nationalists

use this historical revisionism to win domestic national sentiment, and combine it with the current anti-EU and anti-globalization sentiment to form a political narrative that revives “national pride” [13, p. 1–28].

Strategic historical falsification

Falsifying historical memory has become a means for some countries to achieve political goals in great power games. By controlling historical narratives on the international stage, they try to find legitimacy for their foreign policies and domestic governance. Strategic falsification of historical memory not only poses a threat to the objectivity of historical narratives but also has a potential impact on the post-World War II international order. Since the Cold War, some countries led by the United States have taken a series of actions to falsify historical memory based on their international political needs at different times. For example, during the Cold War, the mainstream historical narratives of the United States often focused on the Normandy landings, the Western Front battles, and the victories of the United States in the Pacific theater, while the Soviet Union's victories on the Eastern Front and its tremendous sacrifices were glossed over. This selective memory shaping weakened the Soviet Union's position in the global anti-fascist war. Another example is the manipulation of historical memory in culture and media. During the Cold War, the United States shaped and exported a narrative framework of “freedom against totalitarianism” in World War II through a large number of cultural products such as movies and TV series. This not only consolidated the specific memory of World War II among the public domestically but also influenced global historical cognition through external dissemination, with far-reaching effects even after the end of the Cold War [14, p. 145–146]. In addition, the news media and propaganda agencies of the United States also disseminate specific historical views of World War II at home and abroad. This competition for historical

memory serving political games has become the biggest threat to global peace and international cooperation based on the post-World War II order in the post-Cold War era.

Realistic Path for Disseminating Correct Historical Views of World War II

Maintaining the Post-World War II System through Continuous Strategic Dialogue and Exchange among China, the United States, and Russia.

Continuous strategic dialogue among major powers is a powerful way to maintain the multilateral mechanism and international rule of law centered around the United Nations, which helps consolidate the post-World War II system. China, the United States, and Russia play a central role in the construction and maintenance of global multilateral mechanisms. Institutions such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank all require cooperation and support from major powers, especially the United Nations Security Council, which is the core decision-making mechanism for global security after World War II. Professor Jeffrey Sachs of Columbia University in the United States insightfully pointed out: "Solving global challenges not only requires unilateral actions by China, the United States, and Russia, but also necessitates coordination and cooperation among the three countries to maintain the sustainability of the post-war international order" [15]. If confrontation between countries intensifies, it will directly weaken the authority and effectiveness of the global multilateral mechanism, thereby threatening the foundation of the post-war system. In fact, the strategic direction of attempting to "contain" China or Russia has been historically proven to be detrimental to the United States itself. Shortly after George Frost Kennan released the "Long Telegram", strategist Walter Lippmann published a series of articles opposing the "containment" strategy — that the United States could not use "confrontational forc-

es" at constantly shifting locations around the world [16]. Mao Zedong also highly appreciated Lippmann's strategic vision. Even when Kennan himself soon found out the harm of the "containment" strategy to the United States, he wrote: "countrymen often asked me where to start to deal with the threat of the Soviet Union? My answer was: where the United States failed, what we thought was shameful, or what worried us" [17]. By maintaining strategic dialogue among China, the United States, and Russia, especially within the framework of the United Nations Security Council and international rule of law, the three countries can reach a minimum consensus on global security issues, thus ensuring the substantial existence of the post-war system.

Commemorative activities and other "ritualized" expressions promote the dissemination of the correct view of World War II history.

Commemorative activities are an important manifestation of collective historical memory. Through symbolization and ritualization, they focus the attention of the country, society, and the global public on specific historical events, thereby strengthening consensus on these historical memories. French social psychologist Maurice Halbwachs pointed out that commemorative activities, as symbols of collective memory, enable history to be constantly reproduced in society through the regular reenactment of specific historical events, thus consolidating the moral foundation of historical justice [18]. For example, China and Russia will jointly celebrate the 80th anniversary of the victory of World War II in 2025. For the view of World War II history, this international commemorative event jointly organized by the major victorious countries is not only a commemoration of heroic deeds during the war, but also a reaffirmation of the moral legitimacy of the post-war international order. At the same time, commemorative activities can strengthen the continuous accountability for war crimes.

Commemorative activities have a clear significance in international rule of law. Expressing official positions through symbolic commemorative activities can strengthen the continuous accountability for war crimes. In addition, it is necessary to protect commemorative sites and newly established commemorative symbols. Battlefield sites, war relics, commemorative statues, exhibition halls for evidence of aggressors, and other sites serve as “material memory fields” [19, p. 906–922] that can maintain historical memory at both the physical and symbolic levels, resist the erosion of historical revisionism, and maintain the correct view of World War II history. In addition, to ensure the continuous and accurate dissemination of the historical perspective on World War II, apart from protecting existing offline memorial sites, immersive communication and collective memory construction can be achieved through the application of digital humanities technology. For instance, developing VR virtual memorial halls, restoring historical scenes from a first-person perspective, combining eye-tracking technology to study emotional resonance points of the audience, and optimizing the dissemination effect of digital media platforms.

Grasp the empowering effect of digital technology on historical research

The Second World War involved many countries. Its historical narrative is not limited to the perspective of victorious countries, but also encompasses the diverse memories of defeated countries, occupied countries, and neutral countries. By promoting cross-border historical dialogue and cooperation, countries can reduce differences in historical memory and increase consensus on the history of World War II. Currently, the trend of digitization and visualization of historical memory provides opportunities for global cross-border historical dialogue. Countries should strengthen academic and historical education cooperation under a data-driven historical per-

spective, weaken the influence of historical revisionism, and maintain a correct historical perspective of World War II on a global scale [20].

At the operational level, a transnational cooperation mechanism should be established, utilizing the “Visual History Archive” from Yale University or the Chinese Anti-Japanese War Document Data Center as data sources. Drawing on the collaborative model of Wikidata, an open knowledge graph of World War II history should be constructed, ensuring that technological applications align with the narrative of a community with a shared future for mankind. Additionally, adversarial algorithm models should be designed to conduct semantic recognition and fact verification of World War II rumors on social media, pushing links to authoritative databases to counteract algorithmic interventions promoting historical nihilism. The propagation patterns of related topics on platforms like Bilibili and TikTok can be analyzed using Gephi network graphs, and micro-propagation paths of World War II history on social media can be designed and developed. For instance, social network analysis (SNA) can be employed to mine short videos of oral histories from World War II veterans, identify key opinion leaders (KOLs), and devise precise push strategies based on user personas. Furthermore, a multicultural calibration mechanism should be established to mitigate ethical risks that digital humanities technology may pose, such as monopolizing historical interpretation rights due to algorithmic bias caused by weight deviation in databases.

The education system plays an irreplaceable role in shaping the historical view, worldview, and values of young people. By improving the education system and ensuring that the correct view of World War II history is fully presented in school education, countries can cultivate correct cognition and reflection on history among the next generation from basic education.

Conclusion

After the end of World War II in 1945, the victorious Allied Powers led the reconstruction of the post-war order, especially through the formulation of the Charter of the United Nations and the establishment of a series of international legal and moral systems such as the Nuremberg Trials, the Potsdam Proclamation, and the Cairo Declaration. The values foundation of the “World War II perspective” was established internationally. The international order at this time not only reflected historical justice but also served as an ethical cornerstone for peaceful cooperation, mutual trust, and mutual benefit among nations worldwide. Lenin once pointed out, “Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement” [21]. In the early post-war period, the mainstream historical perspective interpreted the war as a showdown between justice and evil, with the Allied Powers (represented by the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and China) being seen as “heroes” who saved the world by defeating the Axis powers that launched aggression and genocide. It is evident that the formation of this historical perspective is closely related to the historical facts of the war, the construction of the post-war international order, and the perception of


victory and defeat among nations. The correct perspective on World War II, which includes anti-fascist struggle, investigation of war crimes, and recognition of historical responsibility, directly shapes the legitimacy and stability of the post-war international system. From a historical logic perspective, the perspective on World War II not only involves the victory and defeat of the war but also encompasses profound reflections on the morality and responsibility of war, clarifying the profound disasters brought by fascism and militarism to all mankind. From the perspective of practical paths, maintaining the correct perspective on World War II is not only the task of historians but also the collective responsibility of the international community. The revisionist debates surrounding World War II history are actually a direct threat to the existing international order. History and reality are closely connected, so spreading and maintaining the correct perspective on World War II and defending the post-war international system are related to the continuous continuation of global justice and peace, as well as the democratization of world multipolarization and international relations, and more importantly, the development of a more just and reasonable global governance system.

References


1. Berger P., Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality*. London, Routledge, 2016. 122 p.
2. Anderson B. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. *The New Social Theory Reader*. London, Routledge, 2020. pp. 282–288.
3. Bourdieu P. Symbolic Power. *Critique of Anthropology*, 1979, no. 4 (13–14), pp. 77–85.
4. Wendt A. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge, Cambridge university press, 1999. 429 p.
5. Kohn H. Soviet Communism and Nationalism: Three Stages of a Historical Development. *Soviet Nationality Problems*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1971. pp. 43–71.
6. Ng Han Guan. The Spokesperson of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs Reiterated the Provisions of the Cairo Declaration on Japan's Sovereignty. *Russian Satellite News Agency*. 2024. Available at: <https://sputniknews.cn/20240523/1059275811.html>.
7. Gordon A. *A Modern History of Japan from Tokugawa Times to the Present*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2021. 417 p.
8. Becker D. Historical Memory and Public Diplomacy: The case of Russia. *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. London, Routledge, 2020. pp. 301–305.
9. Annan K.A. *We the Peoples: A UN for the Twenty-First Century*. London, Routledge, 2015. 264 p.

10. Schlesinger S.C. *Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations*. New York, Basic Books, 2009. 144 p.
11. Lipstadt D. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. New York, Simon and Schuster, 2012. 278 p.
12. Connelly J., Roseman M., Portnov A. [et al.]. Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 2011, no. 13 (3), pp. 313–352.
13. Eley G. What is Fascism and Where Does It Come From? *History Workshop Journal*, 2021, no. 91 (1), pp. 1–28.
14. Whitfield S.J. Hollywood's Cold War. *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 2008, no. 10 (3), pp. 145–146.
15. Sachs J.D. *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York, Columbia University Press, 2015. 543 p.
16. Lippmann W. The Cold War. *Foreign Aff*, 1986, no. 65, pp. 869.
17. Henry Kissinger. *Grand Diplomacy*. Translated by Gu Shuxin, Lin Tianguai. Haikou, Hainan Publishing House, 2012. 423 p.
18. Halbwachs M. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago, University of Chicago press, 2020. 196 p.
19. Ho Tai H.T. Remembered Realms: Pierre Nora and French National Memory. *The American Historical Review*, 2001, no. 106 (3), pp. 906–922.
20. Judt T. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London, Penguin, 2006. 960 p.
21. Lenin. *Selected Works of Lenin*. Beijing, People's Publishing House, 2012. Vol. 1. 779 p.

Author Information

Zhang Luzhou — PhD Student, Communication Institute, Communication University of China, Beijing, People's Republic of China,  <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1870-6824>.

Информация об авторе

Чжан Лучжоу — аспирант, Институт коммуникаций, Китайский университет коммуникаций, Пекин, Китайская Народная Республика,  <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1870-6824>.