

The Legal Dilemma and Relief Path of Cross Border Pursuit and Recovery of Corrupt Assets in China

Jiacheng Zou

*School of Humanities and Law, Northeastern University, Shenyang, China
3436889370@qq.com*

Abstract. With the increasing complexity of corrupt personnel fleeing and cross-border transfer of corrupt assets, anti-corruption cross-border fugitive and asset recovery has become an important issue in promoting domestic and foreign-related rule of law. In recent years, China has taken the "Supervision Law" and "Criminal Procedure Law" as the main body, and the "Extradition Law" and "International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law" as supporting measures, initially forming a standardized system for anti-corruption cross-border fugitive pursuit and asset recovery, and continuously promoting international cooperation through mechanisms such as extradition, persuasion, repatriation, overseas prosecution, and confiscation of illegal gains. However, the current system still faces problems such as the constraints of treaty conditions and relevant exception principles on extradition cooperation, insufficient standardization of alternative measures for extradition, inadequate rules for cross-border asset return and sharing, and poor connection between absent trials and international judicial assistance. The causes of this include the concealment and complexity of cross-border transfer of corrupt assets, as well as insufficient coordination between domestic legal norms, inadequate connection between domestic and foreign laws, and unstable international cooperation and reciprocity mechanisms. In this regard, it is necessary to further improve the legal system of anti-corruption foreign-related laws and regulations, promote the rule of law of extradition and its alternative measures, improve the system of overseas recovery and asset return and sharing, and enhance the institutionalization and standardization level of anti-corruption international cooperation through deepening international criminal judicial assistance and strengthening information sharing.

Keywords: Anti-corruption, Cross border fugitive pursuit and asset recovery, International Criminal Justice Assistance, foreign-related rule of law

1. Introduction

The report of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China clearly put forward the strategic deployment of "deepening international cooperation in anti-corruption and building an integrated mechanism for fugitive, anti fugitive, and asset recovery", resolutely winning the protracted battle against corruption. This decision incorporates fugitive, anti fugitive, and asset recovery into the comprehensive and strict governance of the Party, undertaking the new era of

fugitive and asset recovery work that China has continuously promoted since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China. From the solemn political oath at the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China that "wherever corrupt elements flee, they should be arrested and brought to justice", to the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, we deepened the treatment of both symptoms and root causes, incorporated "flight prevention" into the anti-corruption governance work, and the centralized and unified leadership of the Party Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping at the core provided a fundamental basis for cross-border corruption governance in the new era.

Currently, the unprecedented major changes are accelerating, and the international environment is complex and ever-changing. With the increasing frequency of activities such as network communication, transportation, and cross-border finance, economic globalization and social informatization are accelerating, and the number of people entering and leaving the country, as well as the scale of cross-border capital circulation, are showing geometric growth. A large number of corrupt individuals take advantage of frequent exchanges between China and foreign countries to flee between countries around the world through immigration, settlement, and overseas escape. They also transfer the proceeds of corruption and bribery to relatives and friends for safekeeping, virtual currency, illegal money laundering, and other means, causing enormous difficulties and challenges to the fight against corruption.

Since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, China has relied on the "Supervision Law", "Criminal Procedure Law" and other laws to initially establish a legal framework for fugitive repatriation and asset recovery. The "Skynet Action" has achieved phased results in extradition, repatriation, arrest and asset recovery. However, cross-border fugitive and asset recovery still faces many difficulties in practice, which urgently need to be alleviated through legal means: some fugitives have been stranded in countries that have not signed effective extradition treaties with China for a long time, the degree of rule of law in persuasion and sentencing commitments needs to be improved, the conditions for extradition cooperation are strict and the norms for alternative measures are still insufficient, the specific rules for asset return and sharing are still incomplete, and the connection between overseas recognition and enforcement of absentee trials and confiscation procedures is not smooth... This article analyzes the institutional causes of the above problems and attempts to propose corresponding improvement measures.

2. The legal logic and normative landscape of cross border anti corruption pursuit of fugitives and stolen assets

2.1. Concept definition and legal value of anti-corruption cross-border fugitive pursuit and asset recovery

Firstly, there are significant differences in the objects, purposes, and paths between "fugitive pursuit" and "asset pursuit": fugitive pursuit mainly aims to urge corrupt fugitives to be brought to justice and held criminally responsible according to law, relying mainly on mechanisms such as extradition, persuasion, and repatriation for personnel transfer or return to their home country; Recovery of stolen assets refers to assets related to corruption crimes, which are recovered through methods such as inquiry, freezing, seizure, confiscation, recovery, and return. It mainly relies on criminal judicial assistance, confiscation of illegal gains, and mechanisms for asset return and sharing. Secondly, as one of the foreign-related legal work, cross-border fugitive and stolen goods recovery has a dual nature of political and legal integration. Its political nature is mainly reflected in the fact that the Party Central Committee has incorporated the pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods

into the comprehensive strategy of strict governance of the Party, and demonstrated the country's anti-corruption determination through actions such as the "Fox Hunt Action" and the "Skynet Action"; Legality requires that all actions taken to combat corruption, cross-border fugitive pursuit, and asset recovery must go through identifiable legal procedures in other countries. The two influence and interact with each other: political guidance guides whether to pursue fugitives, recover stolen goods, and track targets, while legal oversight determines the possibility and procedural path of recovery. Both are indispensable.

2.2. Composition of the normative system for anti-corruption cross-border fugitive pursuit and asset recovery

At the international level, China has joined multilateral conventions such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. The former establishes core rules for extradition, judicial assistance, and other matters related to fugitive repatriation and asset recovery, while the latter provides supplementary basis for cross-border confiscation cooperation. On this basis, China has also entered into bilateral arrangements such as extradition treaties and criminal judicial assistance treaties with multiple countries, providing a treaty basis for making requests to key countries that have fled abroad. The mutual cooperation between multilateral conventions and bilateral treaties constitutes the international legal basis for China to carry out international cooperation in fugitive and stolen goods recovery.

At the domestic level, with the Supervision Law and Criminal Procedure Law as the main body, and the International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law, the Extradition Law, and the Anti Money Laundering Law as supporting documents, a domestic legal system has been formed for the pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods. The special chapter of the Supervision Law stipulates the situation of international cooperation in anti-corruption and clarifies the responsibilities and authorities of the supervisory organs in the pursuit of fugitives and recovered assets; The Criminal Procedure Law has set up procedures for trial by default and confiscation of illegal gains in cases where suspect and defendants escape and die, providing solutions for trial and recovery of stolen goods when overseas cases cannot be reached; The International Criminal Judicial Assistance Act systematically stipulates the scope and procedures for submitting requests for judicial assistance to foreign countries; The extradition law regulates the submission and review of extradition requests; The Anti Money Laundering Law provides financial investigation and control basis for tracking and freezing overseas corrupt assets. The above-mentioned laws have initially formed a coordinated domestic regulatory system, providing a basis for the implementation of international treaty obligations in domestic procedures, but there is still room for further connection and refinement between different laws.

2.3. The rule of law requirements for deepening anti corruption cross border pursuit of fugitives and confiscations in the new era

Under the guidance of Xi Jinping's thought on the rule of law, the pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods has been incorporated into the systematic project of comprehensively promoting the rule of law at home and abroad. The report of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China proposed to deepen international cooperation in anti-corruption and build an integrated mechanism for tracking, preventing, and recovering stolen goods. Pursuing fugitives and recovering stolen goods is an important component of China's anti-corruption struggle and a crucial link in curbing the spread of corruption. Since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the

Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has set up the International Fugitive Recovery Office of the Central Anti Corruption Coordination Group, deployed and carried out Skynet Action, actively participated in international cooperation under the guidance of Xi Jinping's rule of law thinking, and used the rule of law thinking and method to promote the high-quality development of the recovery of fugitives and stolen goods in the new era.

The rule of law requirements for the pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods in the new era are mainly reflected in the overall promotion of the domestic rule of law and the foreign-related rule of law under the guidance of Xi Jinping's rule of law thought, and the dual traction of effectiveness and long-term effectiveness. Practicality requires the implementation, application, and compliance of relevant legal norms in social life, while long-term effectiveness requires the absorption and reference of proven and widely recognized methods and approaches for fugitive and asset recovery, and the gradual formation of stable consensus through international cooperation to ensure the sustainability of fugitive and asset recovery work. Shang Haowen pointed out that balancing effectiveness and long-term effectiveness is the only way to avoid sports style fluctuations and promote the shift from fugitive and asset recovery to normal governance.

3. The practical dilemma of cross border pursuit and recovery of corrupt assets

3.1. At the level of fugitive pursuit: extradition cooperation channels are obstructed

Due to the inherent political nature of extradition and the application of international basic principles of extradition, the application of extradition as a traditional and formal form of international cooperation in fugitive pursuit is still relatively limited in China's anti-corruption and fugitive pursuit practices. Up to now, China has not signed effective bilateral extradition treaties with major countries where fugitives remain, such as the United States, Canada, and New Zealand, and therefore cannot directly submit extradition requests in accordance with the treaties. For example, the United States strictly adopts a bilateral extradition treaty primacy approach in extradition issues; Although there are a few exceptions in its domestic laws, they mainly apply to specific violent crimes, and generally do not apply to corruption crimes. Even if treaties are signed or multilateral conventions are used as a bridge in the future, the principle of "non extradition of the death penalty" may still pose a practical obstacle in the extradition system of many countries that have abolished the death penalty. China's Criminal Law retains the death penalty for crimes such as corruption and bribery, and the other country may refuse extradition on the grounds of "possible death penalty" or require China to make a commitment not to impose the death penalty, thereby increasing cooperation costs. The lack of bilateral extradition treaties, pre treaty requirements, and exceptions such as the death penalty pose significant obstacles to China's extradition cooperation with some major destination countries. In practice, it is often necessary to comprehensively use other alternative measures.

3.2. At the level of fugitive pursuit: the standardization of alternative measures for extradition still needs to be improved

In the context of extradition obstruction, alternative measures such as persuasion, repatriation, and overseas prosecution have played an important role in the process of recovering fugitives [1]. There is still room for improvement in the standardization of measures such as persuasion and repatriation; Although there are already principled norms for overseas prosecution, the acquisition and transfer of

overseas evidence, as well as the connection with domestic criminal procedures, still need to be further refined.

Careful analysis of the information on the successful recovery of the "100 Red Notice fugitives" in China reveals that 75% of them were actually brought back through persuasion [2]. However, persuasion is also the most prominent issue among the three types of measures mentioned above: the nature of persuasion lies between "diplomatic consultation" and "criminal commitment", and the current "Extradition Law", "International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law", and "Criminal Procedure Law" do not provide a clear definition of persuasion, and the applicable subject, procedure, and sequence of extradition requests are not clear; What is particularly crucial is that the legal effect of the sentencing commitment made by the investigating authorities to "reduce, mitigate, or restrict prosecution" for fugitives is unclear - is it a commitment from the administrative authorities or a sentencing recommendation from the judicial authorities within the statutory range? If the court's ruling exceeds the promised amount after returning to China, will the promise bind the judgment? The relevant rules are not clear enough, which may also affect the partner's judgment of the stability and predictability of sentencing commitments. The process of repatriating multiple foreign immigrants is indirectly achieved. For situations where there is no clear provision in non extradition or relevant treaties, the current law lacks unified and clear rules on whether and how the period of overseas detention can be offset against domestic imprisonment. In practice, specific judgments need to be made based on the reasons for detention and whether it is taken in response to China's request for judicial assistance. Overseas prosecution relies on the criminal justice procedures of the country where the fugitive is located. Although the current regulations have made principled provisions for overseas prosecution, there is still room for further refinement in areas such as overseas evidence acquisition, transfer, and connection with domestic criminal procedures. Although the above alternative measures have been widely used in practice, the standardization of supply and the refinement of procedures are still insufficient, which is an important link that needs to be further improved in the legalization of international fugitive and asset recovery.

3.3. At the level of asset recovery: the mechanism for cross-border asset return and sharing is not sound enough

Article 49 of China's International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law has already made principle provisions on asset sharing, allowing necessary expenses to be provided and the recovered property to be shared when assisting us in recovering illegal gains and other involved assets in foreign countries. However, there is still a lack of detailed rules regarding the competent authority, specific proportion, approval procedures, and cost deduction for sharing [3]. Although Article 57 of the Anti Drug Law provides for the sharing of overseas assets in specific fields, its scope of application is limited. From this, it can be seen that China's asset sharing system is not completely blank, but is in a stage where there are already principled regulations but specific rules are still incomplete. In many specific matters, it still needs to be promoted through individual case consultations. Jiang Wei and Cao Wuqing pointed out that China's existing regulations on compensation for judicial assistance fees and asset sharing are relatively principled, and bilateral and multilateral supporting mechanisms still need to be improved; Zhang Sumin and others also believe that there is still a need to further clarify the details of the current system, such as the competent authority, sharing ratio, and specific procedures.

3.4. Connection level: lack of coordination between absent trial and international judicial assistance

The system of trial in absentia is an important procedure for convicting and recovering stolen goods in China when fugitives refuse to return to justice. However, its operational effectiveness is mostly constrained by multiple difficulties such as service of process, recognition, and procedural connection in international judicial assistance. The primary obstacle is the difficulty in delivering legal documents - fugitives often intentionally conceal their whereabouts or change their identities, traditional diplomatic delivery takes a long time, and public notice delivery is difficult to meet the strict requirements of some countries for "actual knowledge", directly affecting the legality and foreign recognition of absent trial procedures. Shang Haowen emphasized in analyzing the mechanism of overseas fugitive pursuit that the weakness of the delivery process has become the primary bottleneck restricting the international effectiveness of trials in absentia. The deeper conflict lies in the risk of being rejected in international extradition cooperation in absentia trials: many countries' extradition systems adopt a cautious or even exclusionary attitude towards "conviction in absentia", believing that judgments made without the defendant appearing in court do not comply with due process, and therefore can refuse extradition or request a retrial. Jiang Xinmiao also pointed out in his review of the legislative history of overseas fugitive and asset recovery that there is an inherent tension between the system of trial in absentia and extradition, and scholars still have different understandings of the significance of trial in absentia for overseas fugitive and asset recovery. In addition, from the perspective of domestic laws, there are still overlapping areas in the procedural connection between the Supervision Law, the International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law, and the Criminal Procedure Law. For example, there is no unified operating procedure for how to transfer absent trial materials to judicial organs after the investigation of the Supervisory Commission is completed, and how to synchronize international criminal judicial assistance requests with absent trial procedures. Lv Yanfeng summarized this as a lack of smooth connection between legal norms, believing that this is the institutional gap that must be overcome in the current pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods from "having laws to rely on" to "good laws and good governance".

4. Analysis of the causes of the difficulties in cross border pursuit and recovery of corrupt assets and escapes

4.1. The concealment of cross-border transfer of corrupt assets increases the difficulty of tracking and identification

With the evolution of economic globalization and the development of international financial activities, the cross-border transfer of corrupt assets has shown highly concealed and complex characteristics, greatly increasing the difficulty of overseas tracking and ownership determination. Criminals are no longer limited to traditional cash smuggling, but instead use false trade contracts, underground bank transactions, and other means to mix illegal funds into huge legal capital flows, creating complex financial transactions and legal frameworks, artificially erasing the connection between capital flow and interest ownership, and deeply mixing illegal gains into international capital flows. In addition, the strict confidentiality system of some offshore financial centers creates an "information barrier", which often puts overseas law enforcement agencies in a passive situation of "not being able to find or recognize". When analyzing the dilemma of overseas asset recovery, Shang Haowen pointed out that the trend of concealment in this asset transfer method has essentially

raised the evidentiary threshold for proving that assets are illegal and criminal proceeds, becoming a key technical factor restricting the effectiveness of cross-border asset recovery.

4.2. Lack of coordination in the domestic legal regulatory system

At present, the shortcomings of China's domestic legal regulatory system are first reflected in the design of the extradition system. The current extradition law was established before the establishment of the National Supervisory Commission and did not include the supervisory commission in the scope of competent authorities. With the deepening of the reform of the supervisory system, although the supervisory commission has become the competent authority for extradition, the higher-level law has failed to timely confirm this change in power, resulting in a lack of clear basis for its legal status and cooperation process in the extradition procedure, which restricts the efficiency of cooperation. Lv Yanfeng pointed out that timely amendments to the law in response to the achievements of the reform of the supervisory system are the key to solving the current extradition dilemma.

In terms of cross-border recognition and enforcement of property judgments involved in cases, China still lacks a systematic and clear two-way procedural mechanism. The existing procedures for confiscating illegal gains can provide domestic judicial basis for the recovery of overseas assets, but how to promote the recognition and enforcement of non conviction confiscation rulings in China overseas, and how to recognize and enforce foreign involved property judgments on the basis of equality and reciprocity, still needs further improvement. Only by gradually establishing rules for mutual recognition and enforcement can a more stable institutional foundation be provided for cross-border asset returns.

In addition, there are still blind spots in the connection between multiple separate laws such as the Supervision Law, the International Criminal Judicial Assistance Law, the Criminal Procedure Law, and the Extradition Law in terms of jurisdiction division, evidence conversion standards, and procedural initiation order. The allocation of powers for fugitive and recovered assets in various laws has not yet formed a seamless institutional loop, and the coordination within the regulatory system urgently needs to be improved.

4.3. Lack of coordination between domestic and foreign rule of law

The difference in operating rules between domestic and foreign rule of law directly raises the threshold for cooperation in cross-border fugitive and asset recovery. There are different institutional arrangements in various countries regarding the decision-making subjects, evidence standards, procedural safeguards, and protection of third-party rights in the freezing, seizure, and confiscation of assets involved in the case. Measures taken by domestic authorities based on their own laws may not necessarily be accepted or enforced by foreign judicial authorities. Therefore, cross-border asset recovery cannot only focus on the completeness of domestic procedures. It is also necessary to conduct research on the national laws of the main cooperating countries and prepare corresponding materials in specific cases in accordance with the laws and international treaty requirements of the requested country, in order to reduce procedural conflicts caused by institutional differences.

4.4. The imperfect reciprocity mechanism and limited discourse power in international cooperation

The international pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods has obvious inter state cooperation attributes, and the effectiveness of cooperation is influenced by multiple factors such as legal system, judicial sovereignty, practical interests, and bilateral relations. In the absence of bilateral treaties or stable cooperation mechanisms, the requested country often needs to comprehensively weigh the cost of assistance, evidence conditions, and domestic legal requirements, which can easily lead to cooperation relying more on individual case consultations and a lack of stable reciprocity expectations. At the same time, some countries are influenced by factors such as political relations, institutional differences, and differences in human rights protection standards, which set higher thresholds for China's relevant international cooperation requests and increase the coordination costs of extradition, repatriation, and recovery cooperation. In addition, there is still room for improvement in the formulation of international anti-corruption rules and the transformation of practical experience in China. Therefore, based on the continuous implementation of multilateral conventions and bilateral treaties, it is necessary to strengthen rule communication and institutional participation, gradually forming a more stable and equal expectation of mutual benefit.

5. The path to relieving the difficulties of cross border pursuit and recovery of corrupt assets

5.1. Improve the anti-corruption and foreign-related legal and regulatory system

Filling the legal gap related to foreign affairs is the foundation for enhancing the level of rule of law in the pursuit of fugitives and stolen goods. The primary task is to create specialized laws to punish cross-border corruption, systematically integrate foreign-related provisions scattered in various separate laws, and fill the gaps in the foreign-related legal and regulatory system [4]. China should base itself on existing legal provisions, refer to international conventions and mainstream practices, and clarify specialized legal provisions such as the definition, scope, and charges of corruption. At the same time, we should accelerate the revision process of the extradition law, anti money laundering law, and international criminal judicial assistance law to adapt to the new pattern of law enforcement and justice after the reform of the supervision system.

In terms of legislative technology, it is necessary to strengthen the connection between domestic and foreign legislation and international rules, especially to refine substantive and procedural rules consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption, in order to reduce procedural obstacles. In addition, in order to address the technical challenges in cross-border fugitive and asset recovery, it is necessary to focus on improving the procedures for confiscating illegal gains, the rules for serving documents in absentia trials, as well as the standards for collecting and identifying cross-border electronic data, in order to reduce cooperation difficulties caused by differences in legal technology. When discussing the improvement of the foreign-related legal system, Wu Jianxiong advocates that clarifying the conviction, sentencing, and jurisdiction allocation of cross-border corruption through specialized legislation is the key to enhancing the credibility of international law enforcement; Lv Yanfeng suggested that the revision of the extradition law should focus on adjusting the competent authorities and optimizing procedures to respond to the practical needs of international cooperation in anti-corruption.

5.2. Promote the rule of law construction of extradition and alternative measures

In addition to traditional cooperation channels such as extradition, the connotation and extension of alternative measures can also be expanded through legal means. On the one hand, it is necessary to actively expand the path of extradition cooperation within the framework of multilateral treaties and explore new extradition models that are in line with China's national conditions; On the other hand, it is necessary to enhance the legalization and institutionalization of alternative measures such as persuasion and repatriation, clarify their attributes as independent overseas fugitive measures, and refine the rules of sentencing commitments in legislation, establish the principles of legality and adequacy, and safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of fugitives and the balance of judicial fairness. At the same time, it is necessary to clarify the implementation subject of the persuasion measures, give corresponding powers to law enforcement and judicial organs with fugitive pursuit responsibilities, and standardize the connection procedure between sentencing commitments and voluntary surrender recognition. When studying the legalization of extradition, Wang Xiaodong pointed out that the transparency and proceduralization of sentencing commitments are important prerequisites for eliminating the doubts of cooperating parties; Shang Haowen emphasized that the rule of law construction of persuasion measures should balance the unity of policy effectiveness and legal rigidity, and avoid excessive interference of administrative power in the judiciary; Liu Shuang suggested exploring flexible extradition paths within the framework of the convention to compensate for the shortcomings of traditional extradition treaties.

5.3. Establish a sound supporting system for overseas asset recovery and asset sharing

Overseas asset recovery not only relies on the initiation of legal procedures, but also requires comprehensive supporting systems. Firstly, it is necessary to strengthen the anti money laundering obligations of specific non-financial institutions such as real estate, lawyers, and accounting firms, adhere to the risk-based principle, enhance the targeted monitoring of suspicious transactions, and cut off the hidden channels of corrupt assets. Secondly, it is necessary to further improve the legal basis for overseas recognition and enforcement of illegal gains confiscation rulings, and promote the establishment of asset return mechanisms that are linked to international cooperation. At the same time, a sound system for sharing cross-border recovered assets should be established, clarifying the subjects, proportions, and procedures of sharing, and stimulating the willingness of asset inflow countries to cooperate through benefit sharing [5]. In addition, it is necessary to make good use of the special procedure for trials in absentia, improve cross-border service rules, and enhance the possibility of domestic judgments being recognized and enforced overseas. Jiang Wei proposed in analyzing international cooperation in asset recovery that the mechanism of asset return and sharing is a lever to leverage international cooperation and must be designed through institutional mechanisms to achieve mutual benefit and win-win outcomes; Shang Haowen pointed out that the improvement of the rules for serving in absentia trials is a key node in activating the international effectiveness of domestic judgments, which helps to form a legal deterrent against fugitives.

5.4. The rule of law approach to deepening international cooperation in anti corruption

Deepening international cooperation requires the coordination of political diplomacy and legal means, and the construction of a comprehensive and multi-level legal cooperation network. Firstly, it is necessary to strengthen the signing and implementation of international treaties, actively sign bilateral extradition treaties, judicial assistance treaties, and asset sharing agreements, and

consolidate the foundation of legal cooperation. Secondly, the supervisory authorities should play a dual role in coordinating and handling affairs as the central authority for judicial assistance under the United Nations Convention against Corruption, in order to enhance China's institutional discourse power in international anti-corruption governance. At the same time, it is necessary to make good use of big data technology to empower international fugitive and asset recovery, and build a cross-border data sharing platform. However, in the process of technology application, it is necessary to properly balance the relationship between data sharing and human rights protection, and prevent technology abuse. In addition, regional cooperation should be deepened, such as exploring the establishment of an anti-corruption, fugitive, and asset recovery cooperation mechanism within the China ASEAN framework, to form a regional governance synergy. Zhao Yongchen believes that building an equal and mutually beneficial international cooperation system is the fundamental way to address the challenges of unilateralism when exploring international legal cooperation in the context of a century of changes; Jiang Wei emphasized the important role of great power diplomacy in consolidating international consensus; Chen Wei elaborated on the dual responsibilities of supervisory agencies in international cooperation; Guo Zhe pays attention to the boundaries of human rights protection in big data applications; Mo Hongxian proposed an innovative plan for anti-corruption and asset recovery related to the internet; Huang Shubiao explored the regional cooperation path under the China ASEAN framework.

6. Conclusion

This article is based on the strategic deployment of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, which aims to deepen international cooperation in anti-corruption and build an integrated mechanism for fugitive, anti fugitive, and asset recovery. It reveals the difficulties faced by cross-border fugitive and asset recovery, such as extradition obstruction, weak asset recovery, and poor procedural connection. At its root, it mainly lies in the insufficient connection between domestic rule of law and foreign-related rule of law, the imperfect mechanism of international cooperation and reciprocity, and the lagging supply of legal norms compared to practical needs. This indicates that cross-border anti-corruption is not only a matter of law enforcement and case handling, but also an institutional proposition on how domestic legal order can gain international judicial recognition.

To solve the above problems, we must adhere to the coordinated promotion of domestic and foreign-related rule of law under the guidance of Xi Jinping's rule of law thought. We need to strengthen the foundation of domestic rule of law through measures such as revising extradition laws and improving procedures for confiscating illegal gains, as well as activate international cooperation through asset sharing rules and multilateral conventions. As Shang Haowen said, we should actively promote anti-corruption national legislation and strengthen legislation in key areas, emerging areas, and foreign-related fields. Only through a legal and standardized institutional path that reduces excessive reliance on individual case consultations can we promote the transformation and upgrading of anti-corruption cross-border fugitive and asset recovery from "special operations" to "normal governance", and contribute Chinese solutions to global corruption governance.

References

- [1] Zhang, L., & Liu, C. (2023). The development and legislation perfection of anti-corruption international cooperation in the view of Supervision Law. *Journal of Liaoning University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 51(5), 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.16197/j.cnki.lnupse.2023.05.005>

- [2] Lv, Y., & Qin, J. (2021). Research on the legalization and standardization of China's international anti-corruption fugitive and asset recovery. *Academic Forum*, (2), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.16524/j.45-1002.20210623.001>
- [3] Zhang, S., & Xu, X. (2024). The current situation, dilemmas and paths of China's international cooperation in anti-corruption fugitive recovery under the new circumstances. *Clean-Governance Study*, 2024(2), 188–202.
- [4] Wu, J., & Xia, C. (2023). On improving foreign-related laws and regulations system of anti-corruption: Opportunities, challenges and countermeasures. *Journal of Hunan University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition)*, 26(3), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.13582/j.cnki.1672-7835.2023.03.017>
- [5] Jiang, W., & Cao, W. (2023). Several issues concerning international cooperation in anti-corruption fugitive and asset recovery. *China Review of Administration of Justice*, (2), 15–26.