

DOI 10.35775/PSI.2025.121.9.031

УДК 32.327

СЮЙ ЧАН

доктор наук, доцент Российского университета
дружбы народов, Профессионально-технического колледжа
Сунюань, Китай
E-mail: 1042238134@pfur.ru

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ МИРОВОГО ПОРЯДКА В ЦИФРОВУЮ ЭПОХУ: ТЕХНОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ МОЩЬ, ПРАВИЛА ИГРЫ И НОВЫЙ ГЕОПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ЛАНДШАФТ

В цифровую эпоху мировая политика стремительно меняется. Традиционные энергетические системы меняются по мере того, как технологии становятся новой осью силы. Современные технологии, такие как большие данные, инструменты шпионажа, возможности кибервойны и машинное обучение, изменили не только практику государственного управления, но и способы оказания влияния на мировом уровне. США сохраняют доминирование в таких ключевых областях, как полупроводники и операционные системы, благодаря преимуществам первопроходца и своей экосистеме технологических гигантов. Китай обладает преимуществами в области АСН и электронной коммерции, в то время как Россия развивает уникальные преимущества в аэрокосмической отрасли и кибербезопасности. Китай выступает за равноправные многосторонние отношения, а Россия делает акцент на суверенном контроле над цифровым управлением. В геополитическом плане борьба за суверенитет данных, киберпространство и цифровую инфраструктуру определяет новые парадигмы безопасности и экономическую динамику государственного развития. В статье предлагаются пути перестройки мирового порядка посредством многостороннего управления, технологического сотрудничества и оптимизации правил, представляя будущий порядок, характеризующийся многополярностью, системами, управляемыми разведкой, и устойчивым развитием. Исследование показывает, что страны ведут острую конкуренцию и сотрудничество в сфере технологической мощи, что меняет глобальный технологический ландшафт. При подготовке исследования были использованы метод качественного анализа и теоретического анализа вторичных источников. В заключении даны рекомендации.

Ключевые слова: цифровая эпоха, мировой порядок, технологическая мощь, геополитика.

XU CHANG

Associate Professor, Peoples' Friendship
University of Russia, PhD Songyuan Vocational
and Technical College, China

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF WORLD ORDER IN THE DIGITAL AGE: TECHNOLOGICAL POWER, RULE GAME, AND NEW GEOPOLITICAL LANDSCAPE

World politics are changing as a result of the digital age. Conventional power systems are changing as technology emerges as the new axis of power. Modern technologies like big data, espionage instruments cyber warfare ability, and machine learning have altered not only governance practices but also the ways in which influence is wielded globally. The U.S maintains dominance in core fields like semiconductors and operating systems through first-mover advantages and its ecosystem of tech giants. China has achieved success in e-commerce, while Russia has cultivated unique strengths in aerospace and cybersecurity. China advocates equitable multilateral frameworks, and Russia emphasizes sovereign control over digital governance. Geopolitically, struggles over data sovereignty, cyberspace, and digital infrastructure are redefining power structures, security paradigms, and economic dynamics. The paper proposes pathways for reconstructing the world order through multilateral governance, technological collaboration, and rule optimization, envisioning a future order characterized by multipolarity, intelligence-driven systems, and sustainability. The study finds that these nations engage in intense competition and cooperation in the realm of technological power, reshaping the global technological landscape. This paper furthers that it would apply the qualitative method, theoretical lenses, secondary sources and would reach to the conclusion.

Key words: Digital age, World order, Technological power, Geopolitics.

Introduction. The Western world and the East were both rich and developed before to the first industrial revolution, and their rates of development were about equal. But with the development of the engine powered by steam, both of these areas became separated, with the Eastern regions falling behind and the nations in the West advancing. From that point on, the United States and European nations led the way in progress. It is now unclear who is in charge of the upcoming Fourth Industrial Revolution, also known as the technical revolution [10].

World affairs watchers like to declare the end of a particular era and the start of another by pointing to a turning point or decisive event. It should come as no surprise that the new coronavirus epidemic has already given rise to a lot of supposition that the world will alter drastically as a result, and that modern history will always be split between pre- and post-coronavirus events. In simple terms, they are too ingrained for modification quickly. The identification of transitional eras that encompass the emergence and decline of particular international regimes is therefore more precise. During these times, aspects of the new order are obviously growing and becoming more

significant, while aspects of the old system are still visible, albeit operating below their peak.

The notion that the American period would last for a very long time is supported by the stabilization of the American economy following the financial meltdown. Additionally, a lot of individuals wish for a technological or other miracle that will restore American dominance or enable the US to exert influence over its adversaries. Technology, along with an innovation has a significant impact on innovations in terms of shifting the power dynamics and creating a new equilibrium. Our predictions that a new, potent technological wave will begin in the 2030s-2040s have already been made. However, it is obvious that the United States is the top contender on this technological lead, and as such, it has a chance to maintain its status as the world's leading nation. Furthermore, the USA has far greater economic power now. For this, excluding the continued authority over the world's data and cash transactions [6. P. 75-95]. The effects of the technological revolution on the new international system itself are more significant. Since funding is required to conduct research into new technologies, it follows that those with money and influence will have more access to the knowledge of the Digital Age. More accuracy is now possible in every product or application thanks to digitization. As a result, a shuttle might dock with a space station that has been set up at a specific spot in outer space. Since it is far more difficult to locate the moving space station in the expanse of space than it is to locate a needle in a haystack, the mathematics of the Digital Age are extremely accurate [12]. At a 2010 tech conference in Barcelona, Spain, Google chief Eric Schmidt spoke on the advent of an entirely novel era. It is the era of mobile computing and mobile data networks. At the same time, China, which was hardly on the technology map in 2010, is currently the target of a full-scale defensive technological war by the United States [4].

As pivotal global actors, China, the U.S, and Russia play decisive roles in this transformation. The U.S., leveraging its long-standing technological hegemony and global influence, seeks to consolidate its digital dominance through technological containment and rule-making. For instance, it has imposed chip embargoes on Huawei and blacklisted Chinese tech firms to curb China's 5G advancements. China, driven by innovation, has rapidly closed the gap in critical domains, actively engaging in global digital governance and advocating for a fairer international order. Russia, harnessing its strategic resources and cyber capabilities, prioritizes digital sovereignty while expanding its influence in cyberspace. Nonetheless, China joined the data-driven economy at the same time as the US and benefited from economic advantages brought about by its massive population. To the surprise of many spectators, China's internet industry survived the Great Firewall's censorship. It flourished thanks to the hiring of tech workers, especially those from Silicon Valley, and the encouragement of private sector start-ups with public sector venture capital and government-funded incubators. Businesses like Baidu, Tencent, and Alibaba prospered. Numerous new businesses that would later become well-known were established, such as Didi, Xiaomi, and Meituan [4]. Nation states have dominated international affairs for over 400 years. That is no longer the case, as they compete for substantial geopolitical influence on the international

scene against a small number of multinational technology behemoths. Chip geopolitics and semiconductor sovereignty are replacing local politics and sovereignty over territory. The digital poles produced by Big Tech have greatly surpassed the geopolitical poles of the post-war globe. Previously thought to be the sole purview of the state, Chinese technology syndicates like Alibaba, Tencent, ByteDance, and Huawei, as well as Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, Google, Facebook, and Twitter, have long been referred to as technology companies and now control nearly every facet of social, economic, and national security [1].

Literature Review. The Rule Game Strategies of Major Actors in China, Russia, and the United States and Their Impact on the World. In accordance with its dominance in the global economy and digital technologies, the USA intentionally creates a self-serving set of regulations. Using its influence in international groups to control the decision-making authority of important organizations like Internet Corporation for allocated numbers and names for an extended period and lead governance of the internet rules; implementing the «Clean Network» plan and working with allies to enact technological barriers on companies like Huawei in China and Kaspersky in Russia to reinvent the rules of the global digital ecosystem; and enforcing mandatory inclusion of rules on free flow of data and cross-border privacy through bilateral and regional trade agreements like the USMCA, effectively squeezing the international market space for Chinese and Russian digital enterprises [4].

These businesses, along with others from across the globe, are driving the current global digital transformation due to their substantial impact over the technologies and services they offer. In the years to come, they will determine how governments demonstrate their financial and military might and alter the social compact. As a result, it is time to consider the novel idea of claiming that digital non-state actors, or large tech companies, are parallel to states; in the changing digital world order, they are more than just government-controlled machinery. Technology companies have a sense of autonomy over the digital world that they have practically created, well beyond the jurisdiction of state regulators. Despite numerous limitations on their performance, tech companies have emerged as important actors in global competition [1].

China vigorously endorses the justice and rationality of global laws and supports the idea of a community with a shared destiny for all people. Suggest the «Global Data Security Initiative» as a Chinese approach for developing regulations governing cross-border data transfer. Through initiatives like the «China ASEAN Information Port,» we will investigate and develop regional regulations for data exchange, connectivity of digital infrastructure, and the application of Chinese knowledge to global digital governance. Russia uses a firm stance in the game of rules and views protecting national security and sovereignty as its top priority. enforcing severe regulations on digital firms' data storage and cross-border transmission, as well as strengthening data sovereignty through law; actively encourage the CIS nations to coordinate their digital regulations and form a regional partnership for digital governance; In order to strengthen our voice in polar digital governance, we support the creation of international cyberspace regulations based on sovereign equality in organizations like the

International Telecommunication Union (ITU), oppose US cyber hegemony, and create guidelines and standards that support our interests in building digital infrastructure in the Arctic [7. P. 67-83].

Ahmad (2022) furthers his point that countries have expanded their foreign contacts significantly on their own, in addition to responding to their domestic quarters. It appears that national identity, internationalism, and idealism are influencing IT companies' foreign stances as globalist, nationalist, and techno-utopian enterprises, based on the emergence of competition. Furthermore, this developing field of digital science and technology is influencing and changing interactions between people outside of government organizations. Algorithms have played a significant role in the creation of several communication channels that are open to everyone. As social, political, and economic institutions continue to migrate from tangible to virtual space, their authority in the digital realm will only increase [1].

The impact of rule-based games on the reconstruction of world order The great powers of today participate in extensive international technological politics. The new «Great Game» is the weaponization, control, and mastery of technological advances. Technological areas of influence are being shaped in part by these power dynamics. Countries in central Eastern Europe, the Balkans, Africa, the Indo-Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean have been or will soon be dominated by Chinese or Russian technology. Because of China's and the United States' asymmetrical capability, AI has emerged as the focal point of geopolitical confrontation. Once more, the US is at the forefront of this technological revolution. America's reputation has suffered during the past four years. The Chinese have expanded their reach. Global geopolitical power struggles are inherently unstable. Additionally, there is a struggle between competing ideas of digital power, between well-established (US) and emerging (Chinese) digital giants, each of which has distinct advantages in various areas of digitalization [11. P. 327-335].

Alibaba and Tencent have taken over the same industries in China, along with social media, video-streaming networks, and monetary transaction mechanisms. In order to penetrate new markets, the aforementioned companies are expanding their collaboration with the government-run Digital Silk Road project. The field of national security, which was once the exclusive purview of governments and, to a lesser extent, their suppliers of weapons and ammunition, has also been altered by internet channels. In the modern world, IT firms have taken on the duty of monitoring and regulating the nation-states' airspace in digital space, replacing the traditional job of arms suppliers, which was to provide fighter jets and missiles to the armies [1].

On the negative side, the rule game caused by the divergence of interests among the three countries has exacerbated the instability of the world order. In the field of digital trade, the conflict of rules between China and the United States has triggered trade frictions and the risk of technological decoupling. The United States has imposed tariffs and restricted investment on Chinese digital enterprises, while China has taken countermeasures. The confrontation between the two sides has impacted the global digital trade order; the differences in cybersecurity rules have made cyberspace a

«lawless place». In 2024, the number of global cyber-attacks increased by 32% year-on-year, and data breaches caused economic losses exceeding \$400 billion. The three countries' cyber-attacks and defenses have increased the uncertainty of international security. In addition, the game of rules has also led to a «polarization» in the digital field. The United States dominates high-end technology and rulemaking with its rule advantage, while China and Russia have made breakthroughs in some areas. However, the overall voice of developing countries is lacking, and the global digital divide continues to widen.

In order to establish a new system of global governance for the digital age, some analysts have called for a «digital Bretton Woods» meeting. The gathering would cover topics such as data governance, artificial intelligence, multinational corporations' tax evasion, and global norms for measuring the digital and invisible economy. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) should spark a new Bretton Woods moment «to address these new global realities as a result of uncommon digital factors creating our world,» according to James Balsillie, co-founder of the Institute for New Economic Thinking [2].

The New Landscape of Geopolitics in the Digital Age. The Rise and Connotation of Digital Geopolitics. Countries and their financial and military might have dominated the structure of worldwide power for centuries, allowing them to sway world events in their favor in international affairs. It is also clear that technology has always had an irreversible impact on states and communities, influencing humankind's capacity to harness its positive effects in these areas and get past geographical and physical obstacles.

Hong Loi (2024) adds more that similar to the trends of traditional geopolitics, which has been defined by power alignment, the United States and its allies have a large and notable jurisdictional connect as well as domestic frameworks that allow them to exclude certain actors and states and force important players to share information. Although the US has the jurisdiction to demand information from important participants in the field of internet communications, it does not have the domestic means to compel other governments to leave the network. A sign of the growing tensions between the two largest economies in the world is China's rise to prominence as a geopolitical rival of the US. The disagreement over trade has become something of a «tech war» as a result of U.S. restrictions brought on by China's recent rapid technology advancements. These include restricting Huawei's use of advanced chips and banning TikTok from using federal devices in the United States in 2022 due to national security concerns regarding its Chinese ownership. There are growing worries that China and the United States may split into two distinct digital ecosystems, increasing geopolitical unpredictability.

The traditional framework of geopolitics has undergone a dynamic transformation as a result of states' differing capacities to use new technologies for both military and commercial ends. In the study of geopolitics, this led to the coining of the term «techno-nationalism,» which refers to the state's aim to minimize or avoid reliance on foreign technologies. Because of China's desire to become independent of Western

technical influences, some academics believe that techno-nationalism has implications for the US-China tech-war [7. P. 67-83].

Given America's perennial objective of stifling China's ascent to prominence as an economic and military force, the two countries were already on a hostile road even before this new century began. But the relationship remained one of «tacit allies» until 2008. President George W. Bush only once, in the same sentence as India, referred to China in his 2008 State of the Union address while discussing the significance of sizable growing economies for environmental policy. The primary practical action was to further the US goal in having Beijing strengthen its intellectual property protection, even as President Barack Obama's 2009 «pivot to Asia» at the start of the data-driven economy signaled American apprehension of China's rise (2023).

The main manifestations of digital geopolitics. According to the Russian writer, the entire globe is becoming more and more split between two opposing strategies for governing cyberspace, with China and Russia leading one camp and democratic nations in the West controlling the other. He shows that the nations on Russia's side are «much more primitive technologically as well as less integrated into the digital world» than those on the U.S. side by tallying a number of important indices for nations cosponsoring competing cyber-related resolutions proposed by Russia and the U.S. at the United Nations in 2018 and 2020: «There appears to be a clear borderline between those that pursue strong government control similar to Russia's 'sovereign internet' or China's 'Great Firewall' and those who support liberty of speech and a more democratic internet» [8].

The Impact of Digital Geopolitics on World Order. Since businesses and governments are key players in geopolitical power dynamics, the source of contemporary geopolitical power is frequently disputed, despite the fact that it is increasingly reliant on exposure to and use of data and technology. Since technology and data are weaponized internationally and hacking of vital infrastructure becomes commonplace, the absence of borders in cyberspace fuels geopolitical conflicts. Digitalization, AI, and digital technology have emerged as the focal points of global strife [11. P. 327-335]. But these days, emerging technologies have a big impact on a lot of global developments. Innovative innovations are altering spatial, temporal, and even political elements, and geopolitics is getting new instruments to impact society and the state and bring about other changes. This relationship is reciprocal since new technologies have an impact on geopolitics as well because they are influencing the state, society, and geopolitics' primary clients. Thanks to modern technology, the world is changing far more quickly than it did in the past and is becoming a global village in the twenty-first century. This is true in the areas of politics, security, culture, and the economy.

The phrase «digital geopolitics» refers to the manner in which that technological advances are altering the dynamics of international relations. States now have more ways to exert influence and power because to digital technologies, but they also face new risks and difficulties. State-sponsored cyberattacks and espionage have become more possible because of digital technologies, endangering both individual and national security. New kinds of economic competitiveness have been made possible

by digital technologies, especially in the data and technology sectors. States compete for advantages in fields like artificial intelligence and 5G networks, which might have major geopolitical repercussions. New types of information warfare, such as the dissemination of misinformation and fake news, have been made possible by digital technologies. This has the potential to weaken democratic institutions and affect election results [5].

Conclusion. Research has shown that the development of digital technology has led to fundamental changes in the technological power landscape. The competition and cooperation among China, the United States, and Russia in the field of digital technology have reshaped the global technological power map. In terms of game rules, the three countries have divergent rules in areas such as cross-border data flow, cybersecurity, and artificial intelligence ethics, leading to fragmented international rules and exacerbating the instability of the international order. The rise of digital geopolitics has made the competition among the three countries for data sovereignty, cyberspace, and digital infrastructure a new geopolitical focus, profoundly affecting the power structure of international relations, international security order, and global economic order. In the trend of intelligence, the three countries have revolutionized the global governance model through the application of technologies such as artificial intelligence and big data; The trend towards greenization has prompted the three countries to deeply integrate digital technology with sustainable development, providing a new path for the sustainable development of the world order. These trends are intertwined and influence each other, jointly shaping a new form of world order in the digital age. Furthermore, the subject matter of geopolitics has shifted from traditional territory and dependent on resources issues to more immaterial and interconnected areas as a result of the swift development of technological advances. The players and instruments used to shape global power dynamics have changed as geopolitical material moves from the realm of reality to the digital sphere.

REFERENCES:

1. **Ahmad E.** (2022, March 5). New digital world order. Retrieved from Express Tribune // <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2346401/new-digital-world-order>.
2. **Azmeh S.** (2021, May 17). Navigating a new digital era means changing the world economic order. Retrieved from The conversation // <https://theconversation.com/navigating-a-new-digital-era-means-changing-the-world-economic-order-160488>.
3. **Chandler.** (2020). Digital governance in the Anthropocene: The rise of the correlation machine. Critical Studies on Security.
4. **Ciuriak D.** (2023, July 19). The Digital Revolution Has Transformed Geopolitics; Seeing can no longer be equated with believing. Retrieved from Center for International Governance innovation // <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/the-digital-revolution-has-transformed-geopolitics/>.

5. **Danish R.** (2023, April 18). Digital – Geopolitics: A New Concept in International Relations 2023. Retrieved from World Geostrategic Insight // <https://www.wgi.world/digital-geopolitics-a-new-concept-in-international-relations/>.
6. **Grinin L.E.** (2016). Evolution of World Order. Russian Science Foundation.
7. **Hong Liu C.M.** (2024). Digital geopolitics in a VUCA world: China encounters a new global order. Global policy.
8. **Lauren Zabierek C.L.** (2021, June 10). US-Russian Contention in Cyberspace: Are Rules of the Road Necessary or Possible? Retrieved from Russia Matters // <https://www.russiamatters.org/sites/default/files/media/files/PDF-CyberRulesoftheRoad-061021-RMPaper.pdf>.
9. **Lindsay.** (2013). Stuxnet and the limits of cyber warfare. Security Studies.
10. **María I.** (2021, December 15). The new global technological order: two worlds in one world. Retrieved from Telefonica // <https://www.telefonica.com/en/communication-room/blog/the-new-global-technological-order-two-worlds-in-one-world/>.
11. **Masevski C.** (2021). Digital Geopolitics. Scientific article.
12. **Muhammad M.** (2009, May 28). Envisioning a New World Order and its Implications in the Digital Age. Retrieved from Global Asia // https://www.globalasia.org/v4no3/feature/envisioning-a-new-world-order-and-its-implications-in-the-digital-age_mahathir.