



RECEIVED 13 February 2026
ACCEPTED 26 June 2026
PUBLISHED 31 July 2026

CITATION

Pratama VA, Dewi ZA, (2026).
Post-Correctional Legal
Implementation for Former
Terrorism Convicts from a Justice
Perspective. *Ilomata International
Journal of Social Science*. 7 (3),
978-985.
doi: 10.61194/ijss.v7i3.2178

TYPE Original Research

PUBLISHED 31 July 2026
DOI 10.61194/ijss.v7i3.2178
VOL 7 Issue 3 July 2026

COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Pratama and Dewi. This
is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of
the Creative Commons
Attribution License (CC BY). The
use, distribution or reproduction
in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s)
and the copyright owner(s) are
credited and that the original
publication in this journal is
cited, in accordance with
accepted academic practice. No
use, distribution or reproduction
is permitted which
does not comply with these
terms.

Post-Correctional Legal Implementation for Former Terrorism Convicts from a Justice Perspective

Vinanda Ade Pratama¹, Zakhroh Aulia Dewi²

¹²Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Central Java, Indonesia

Correspondence: veanvinanda21@gmail.com¹

Abstract

This study examines the legal construction of post-correctional punishment execution for former terrorism convicts within the Indonesian correctional system, focusing on the balance between security, reintegration, and justice after release. Existing scholarship generally emphasizes three perspectives: surveillance and risk management, deradicalization as a counterterrorism strategy, and limited rights-based reintegration analyses that inadequately address legal guarantees for former convicts. This study critically assesses the normative coherence of post-correctional legal frameworks in reflecting principles of justice, using Banyumas Regency as a contextual legal reference. A normative juridical method with qualitative analysis was employed, relying on statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and theories of justice concerning corrections, counterterrorism, and human rights. The analysis was conducted through statutory interpretation and doctrinal evaluation without empirical field investigation. The findings indicate that, although post-correctional supervision and deradicalization are formally regulated, the legal framework lacks detailed operational standards, measurable indicators, and effective coordination mechanisms at the local level. These normative gaps may hinder substantive justice by limiting proportional supervision and protection of former convicts' socio-economic rights. The study concludes that the current framework has not fully incorporated restorative and reintegrative justice principles in a coherent and operational manner. Accordingly, a more structured, rights-oriented post-correctional model is required to strengthen legal certainty, community participation, social empowerment, and a balanced relationship between public security and individual rights protection.

KEYWORDS

former terrorism convicts; indonesia; justice principle; post-correctional law; social reintegration.

Introduction

Former terrorism offenders in Indonesia face post-release risks such as stigma, limited economic access, and security concerns. In 2022, Indonesia had 1,031 terrorism inmates, and 1,362 offenders were released during 2015–2021, with a recidivism rate of 11.39% (Noor, 2024). This suggests criminal law should not be purely punitive, as reflected in high-risk prisons (Maulana et al., 2022), but should also uphold human rights and social order (Ismed, 2021). Their reintegration depends on effective deradicalization and social reintegration programs that reduce stigma and expand economic opportunities without weakening security (Wahab et al., 2024).

In the broader academic landscape, studies on terrorism-related offenders in Indonesia tend to cluster into three dominant strands. First, surveillance and risk management approaches emphasize monitoring and control as primary strategies for preventing recidivism (Siregar, 2025). Deradicalization programs are predominantly framed as an extension of national counterterrorism policy, with a primary focus on ideological transformation achieved via state-directed initiatives that seek to reinternalize Pancasila values among convicted offenders (Saputro et al., 2026). A relatively limited corpus of research, however, addresses reintegration from a rights-based perspective that encompasses legal guarantees, social inclusion

mechanisms, and post-correctional justice, as illustrated by the enduring challenges of stigma, familial rejection, and economic precarity confronting the 1,362 former terrorism offenders released between 2015 and 2021 (Noor, 2024). This imbalance has resulted in an underdeveloped normative framework for determining the appropriate execution of punishment following release, especially in reconciling formal legal obligations with the principles of restorative and reintegrative justice (Anisa & Syauquillah, 2023).

Normatively, the Indonesian correctional system, as stipulated in Law Number 12 of 1995 on Corrections, emphasizes rehabilitative and reintegrative objectives alongside retributive elements (Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 1995 Tentang Pemasyarakatan, 1995). This orientation reflects the paradigm of substantive justice, which seeks equilibrium between legal certainty, social utility, and fairness. However, empirical indications in prior studies suggest a persistent disjunction between these normative ideals and the lived realities of former terrorism convicts, who often encounter structural discrimination and social exclusion upon reintegration (Cherney & Belton, 2021; Tonry, 2021). Such conditions indicate that the legal design of post-correctional mechanisms has not yet been fully translated into coherent and operational practices.

The implementation of post-correctional law in Indonesia encounters substantial hurdles at the local government level, where national legal frameworks are frequently undermined by inadequate institutional support and inter-agency coordination (Rahmawati, 2025). Banyumas Regency provides a valuable regional contextual reference for this analysis, as it illustrates the typical configuration of actors including Balai Pemasyarakatan, local government agencies, and community organizations responsible for translating national mandates into practice (Santoso & Wijaya, 2023). The lack of explicitly defined coordination standards, comprehensive operational guidelines, and quantifiable indicators at this level reveals a critical structural limitation in converting legal norms into functional implementation frameworks (Prasetyo, 2024). These deficiencies are symptomatic of broader challenges in Indonesia's decentralized system, often resulting in fragmented service delivery for offender reintegration and highlighting the need for more robust multi-level governance mechanisms (Lestari et al., 2021).

Against this background, the present study examines the extent to which the implementation of the law on the execution of punishment for former terrorism convicts reflects principles of justice within this regional contextual reference. By focusing on normative coherence, regulatory design, and the alignment between legal provisions and justice principles, this study addresses a specific gap in the literature concerning the post-correctional phase of punishment. Theoretically, this inquiry contributes to the ongoing shift in criminal law discourse from retributive paradigms toward restorative and reintegrative justice frameworks (Cherieshta et al., 2024; McGlynn et al., 2023).

Methodologically, this research employs a normative juridical approach, analyzing statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and theories of justice without relying on empirical field data. Accordingly, the findings are intended to provide a conceptual and doctrinal contribution to the development of a more coherent, rights-based, and operationally grounded framework for post-correctional punishment execution, particularly in addressing the challenges of reintegrating former terrorism convicts into society.

Methods

Research Type

This study adopts a normative juridical research method

with a qualitative analytical approach to examine the legal norms, principles, and doctrines governing the execution of criminal punishment for former terrorism convicts, particularly in the post-correctional phase (Hutchinson, 2023). The analysis is directed at evaluating the normative coherence, regulatory design, and alignment of legal frameworks with principles of corrective justice, restorative justice, and human rights-based approaches, rather than measuring empirical outcomes or program effectiveness (Braithwaite, 2022). Banyumas Regency is employed as a regional contextual reference, functioning as an illustrative jurisdiction to situate the analysis within a concrete administrative framework without implying empirical case investigation (Roach, 2021). This methodological choice enables a rigorous doctrinal evaluation of the legal instruments governing the post-correctional supervision and reintegration of former terrorism convicts in accordance with Indonesia's criminal justice system (Wibowo, 2023).

Research Object and Scope

This research examines the legal norms and policy frameworks that regulate the post-correctional treatment of former terrorism convicts in Indonesia, a focus that is essential for understanding mechanisms aimed at facilitating successful societal reintegration and mitigating potential security risks following release from correctional institutions (Anwar & Priyatmono, 2025). The analytical scope is restricted to statutory regulations pertaining to corrections, counterterrorism, and human rights, alongside relevant legal doctrines, thereby enabling a comprehensive assessment of how these instruments influence the implementation of rehabilitation initiatives (Masithoh et al., 2022). Furthermore, the study draws upon contemporary theories of justice concerning punishment execution and social reintegration to evaluate the effectiveness and equity of existing post-release arrangements for former convicts (Mubaraq, 2022). Substantively, the investigation is delimited to the post-imprisonment phase and deliberately excludes pre-adjudication and adjudication stages in order to concentrate analytical attention on the execution of punishment and its enduring implications for social reintegration (Bayuna, 2025).

Contextual Locus (Regional Reference)

This study is conceptually situated in Banyumas Regency, Central Java, Indonesia, as a regional contextual reference. The selection of this locus is based on its relevance in illustrating the institutional configuration at the local level, particularly the interaction between correctional institutions (e.g., Balai Pemasyarakatan), local government authorities, and community actors responsible for implementing national legal mandates. The reference to Banyumas is strictly analytical, aimed at mapping the distribution of institutional responsibilities and identifying potential normative gaps in coordination and operationalization, rather than presenting empirical findings.

Legal Materials and Data Sources

The research relies exclusively on secondary legal materials, systematically classified into three categories. Primary legal materials include binding statutory instruments, such as the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections (Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 Tentang Pemasyarakatan, 2022), Law No. 12 of 1995 on Corrections, Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 on the Prevention of Terrorism, and relevant policy guidelines issued by the Directorate General of Corrections and the National Counterterrorism Agency (Mumtaz JR et al., 2023). Secondary legal materials consist of peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and academic commentaries addressing terrorism, correctional systems, justice theories, and post-correctional reintegration. Tertiary materials include

legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and official explanatory documents used to clarify legal terminology and conceptual frameworks.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected through a systematic document-based approach. Legal and regulatory texts were obtained from official government repositories to ensure authenticity and validity. Academic literature was sourced from recognized scholarly databases, including Google Scholar, Scopus-indexed journals, and national legal journal platforms. The selection process followed explicit criteria: (1) substantive relevance to post-correctional law and justice theory, (2) academic credibility indicated by peer-review status or institutional authority, and (3) temporal relevance, prioritizing publications from 2018 to 2025. All selected materials were catalogued and organized thematically to facilitate structured analysis.

Data Analysis Technique

The analysis employed qualitative normative techniques, consisting of statutory interpretation, conceptual analysis, and doctrinal evaluation, to examine the regulatory framework (McConville, 2021). Statutory interpretation was conducted using systematic and teleological methods to examine the internal consistency of legal provisions and their intended objectives (Van Hoecke, 2021). Conceptual analysis was applied to clarify the relationship between legal norms and theoretical constructs of justice, particularly restorative and reintegrative justice (Braithwaite, 2002). Doctrinal evaluation was used to identify normative gaps, such as the absence of operational standards, measurable indicators, and coordination mechanisms within the regulatory framework, while cross-referencing between legal provisions and scholarly interpretations was conducted to ensure that conclusions were grounded in coherent legal reasoning rather than subjective judgment (Hutchinson, 2023).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical review was not applicable because this study exclusively utilized publicly available legal materials and did not involve human participants, interviews, or field data collection. This approach is consistent with institutional research policies that exempt normative legal studies from formal ethical clearance requirements. Nevertheless, the study adheres to principles of academic integrity through accurate citation practices, objective interpretation of sources, and systematic verification of legal materials to prevent misrepresentation and ensure analytical reliability.

Result and Discussion

Post-Correctional Legal Implementation for Former Terrorism Convicts

The results of the normative analysis indicate that the post-correctional legal implementation for former terrorism convicts formally adheres to the national legal framework, particularly Law Number 22 of 2022 on Corrections. This regulation emphasizes rehabilitation and social reintegration as the primary objectives of punishment, which are subsequently operationalized through post-release supervision mechanisms such as parole and conditional leave. Within this framework, the Correctional Center (Balai Pemasyarakatan/Bapas), including Bapas Purwokerto, is normatively designated as the principal institution responsible for post-release guidance and supervision. This reflects a normative alignment between the legal design and the principles of corrective and reintegrative justice.

However, a doctrinal examination of the legal framework demonstrates that the provisions governing inter-agency

coordination remain general and are not accompanied by detailed operational mechanisms. Article 95 paragraph (1) of Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections stipulates that the implementation of correctional functions may involve cooperation with ministries, government institutions, and other stakeholders. Likewise, Article 89 and Article 90 of Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 concerning Prevention of Terrorism and Protection of Investigators, Public Prosecutors, Judges, and Correctional Officers emphasize coordination and cooperation among relevant institutions in the implementation of guidance and supervision for terrorist offenders. Nevertheless, these provisions merely establish a normative obligation to coordinate and do not provide specific standard operating procedures (SOPs), performance indicators, technical guidelines, or cross-sectoral mechanisms concerning the division of responsibilities, frequency of coordination, monitoring procedures, and evaluation standards. From a normative perspective, this condition creates room for discretionary variations among institutions because no uniform legal parameters regulate the intensity, methods, and assessment of post-release supervision.

Deradicalization programs, as part of post-correctional legal implementation, also demonstrate normative consistency with rehabilitative objectives. Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019, particularly Article 88, provides that deradicalization measures encompass ideological development, religious moderation, and vocational empowerment aimed at facilitating social reintegration. These components reflect a multidimensional approach integrating cognitive, spiritual, and economic transformation. However, doctrinal analysis indicates that the existing regulatory framework does not prescribe measurable indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of reintegration programs. Neither Law Number 22 of 2022 nor Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 explicitly requires indicators relating to economic self-sufficiency, social participation, or post-release behavioral stability. Therefore, these indicators are not derived from positive law but are proposed analytically by the author based on restorative justice and reintegrative justice theory. Economic self-sufficiency is proposed because successful reintegration presupposes the capacity of former offenders to maintain lawful livelihoods and reduce recidivism risks. Social participation is relevant because restorative justice emphasizes the restoration of relationships between offenders and the community, while post-release behavioral stability reflects the reintegrative objective of sustaining non-violent and socially acceptable conduct. The omission of such evaluative criteria in existing legal instruments reveals a normative gap between the rehabilitative goals proclaimed by the legislation and the mechanisms available to assess their achievement.

At the local level, the involvement of regional governments is normatively acknowledged within the framework of decentralization and cross-sectoral coordination. However, no explicit provisions regulate the technical role of local governments in the reintegration process, including aspects such as employment facilitation, social support, and stigma reduction. The absence of such regulation in both national laws and their implementing instruments indicates that the role of local governments remains implicit and has not been operationally institutionalized. Accordingly, it can be normatively concluded that a regulatory gap exists in integrating local actors into the post-correctional system.

Structural and Socio-Cultural Conditions Affecting Reintegration

A doctrinal analysis of the existing legal framework reveals a regulatory-design gap concerning the institutional and financial dimensions of social reintegration. Although Article 95 paragraph (1) of Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections recognizes cooperation with ministries,

government agencies, and other stakeholders in the implementation of correctional functions, the provision does not specify the distribution of authority or define cross-sectoral responsibilities among central government institutions, regional governments, and non-state actors. Similarly, Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 emphasizes coordination and cooperation in the implementation of deradicalization and post-release guidance but does not establish detailed mechanisms regarding the respective roles of participating institutions.

In addition, neither Law Number 22 of 2022 nor Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 contains explicit provisions governing sustainable funding arrangements for social reintegration programs. Existing regulations provide a general normative basis for rehabilitation and reintegration but do not prescribe dedicated financing mechanisms, budget-sharing arrangements, or long-term economic and social support schemes for former terrorist offenders. Consequently, from a normative perspective, the legal framework demonstrates an absence of regulatory instruments capable of ensuring the continuity of reintegration assistance beyond the correctional setting. This omission reflects a regulatory gap between the rehabilitative objectives embodied in the legislation and the institutional and financial arrangements necessary to support their realization.

From a socio-legal perspective, although not directly regulated within legal norms, the literature consistently identifies social stigma as a significant external factor hindering reintegration. However, the current legal framework does not accommodate normative instruments to address such barriers, including community-based programs or mechanisms for social reconciliation. This absence suggests that the legal approach remains predominantly oriented toward administrative supervision rather than social transformation, thereby potentially weakening the realization of substantive justice.

Thus, the combination of structural regulatory gaps and the absence of normative instruments to address social barriers indicates a misalignment between legal objectives and their implementation design. This finding underscores that reintegration challenges are not merely technical in nature but also reflect limitations within the legal paradigm in addressing social dimensions comprehensively.

Normative Indicator Framework for Post-Correctional Justice

As a key conceptual finding, this study identifies the need for a normative indicator framework to evaluate post-correctional legal implementation. Based on theories of restorative and reintegrative justice, at least four principal indicators should be incorporated into the regulatory framework:

1. Non-discrimination: The absence of discriminatory treatment toward former convicts in accessing public services and economic opportunities.
2. Access to livelihood: The availability of legal mechanisms ensuring access to employment or productive economic activities.
3. Proportional supervision: A balanced supervision system that aligns security interests with individual rights, supported by clear and measurable limits.
4. Community participation: The involvement of communities in reintegration processes through community-based programs and social reconciliation mechanisms.

An analysis of Law Number 22 of 2022 and Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 demonstrates that these indicators have not been explicitly formulated as evaluative parameters or operational standards. The absence of such an indicator framework makes it difficult to assess the extent to

which legal implementation achieves substantive justice and creates room for inconsistent interpretation across institutions.

Main Finding

The findings indicate that post-correctional legal implementation for former terrorism convicts is normatively well-established within the Indonesian correctional framework (see Table 1). Legal compliance with Law No. 22 of 2022 and Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 demonstrates a clear policy orientation toward rehabilitation and social reintegration rather than retributive punishment. Institutional supervision through the *Balai Pemasyarakatan* reflects a structured mechanism of post-release control designed to balance security considerations with reintegration rights. However, inter-agency coordination remains largely administrative, relying on general mandates rather than detailed operational standards. This condition limits consistency and reduces the effectiveness of collaborative implementation across institutions. As a result, normative legal coherence is not fully translated into integrated operational practice.

Furthermore, the findings reveal that structural and socio-cultural factors significantly shape reintegration outcomes beyond the formal legal framework. The absence of standardized procedures and sustainable budget allocation weakens local government capacity to support reintegration programs effectively. Vocational training, employment facilitation, and psychosocial assistance remain limited, reinforcing a supervision-oriented rather than development-oriented approach. Socio-cultural stigma within communities further exacerbates these limitations by restricting access to employment and social participation. Legal norms recognize reintegration as a fundamental objective, yet they provide limited instruments to address community acceptance and stigma reduction. Consequently, the combined influence of structural gaps and socio-cultural resistance constrains the realization of sustainable post-correctional reintegration.

This study situates the analysis of post-correctional punishment for former terrorism convicts within the broader discourse on deradicalization and reintegration, which has predominantly been shaped by security-oriented governance programmatic deradicalization approaches (Chaidar, 2011). While these perspectives emphasize surveillance and ideological transformation, they tend to underexplore the and normative dimensions of justice, legal coherence, and rights protection. In contrast, this study advances a justice-oriented legal analysis by examining how regulatory design, institutional mandates, and evaluative indicators shape the realization of reintegrative justice. By positioning former terrorism convicts as legal subjects rather than objects of control, the analysis highlights the gap between normative legal objectives and their operational articulation within the regional contextual reference of Banyumas Regency.

On the one hand, the state bears an obligation to ensure public security and prevent recidivism; on the other hand, it must guarantee the fulfillment of fundamental rights, including the right to fair and humane reintegration (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections). The results of this study, which are derived from doctrinal analysis of legal instruments rather than empirical observation, demonstrate that the regulatory framework applicable to the Banyumas contextual locus provides for post-correctional mechanisms based on supervision, guidance, and deradicalization programs. These mechanisms are normatively embodied in Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections and Government Regulation Number 77 of 2019 concerning Prevention of Terrorism and Protection of Investigators, Public Prosecutors, Judges, and Correctional Officers. However, the absence of detailed operational standards, measurable indicators, and binding technical guidelines indicates the existence of a regulatory-design gap that potentially allows

Table 1. Main Normative Findings of the Study

No.	Main Finding Category	Description of Key Findings
1	Normative Legal Compliance	The post-correctional framework under Law No. 22 of 2022 formally adopts rehabilitative and social reintegration principles through legally recognized supervision mechanisms.
2	Institutional Supervision Mechanism	The legal framework assigns Balai Pemasyarakatan (Bapas) as the principal institution responsible for post-release supervision through parole and conditional leave mechanisms.
3	Inter-Agency Coordination	Law No. 22 of 2022 and Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 provide a normative basis for inter-agency coordination; however, detailed operational standards, SOPs, and performance indicators are not expressly regulated.
4	Rehabilitation and Deradicalization Programs	Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 establishes deradicalization programs comprising ideological guidance, religious moderation, and vocational empowerment as components of rehabilitation and reintegration.
5	Regulatory Design of Local Stakeholder Involvement	Existing legal instruments recognize cooperation with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders but do not clearly define the authority, responsibilities, or technical guidelines governing local government participation.
6	Institutional and Financial Regulatory Gaps	The current legal framework does not provide detailed provisions concerning coordination mechanisms, budget-sharing arrangements, or sustainable funding schemes necessary to support long-term reintegration programs.
7	Literature-Supported Contextual Risks	Previous studies and scholarly literature indicate that social stigma and limited community acceptance may constitute challenges to the realization of reintegrative justice, although these aspects are not specifically regulated within existing legal instruments.

variations in interpretation and implementation among institutions. Such variations arise not from empirically verified institutional practices but from the lack of uniform normative parameters governing inter-agency coordination, monitoring procedures, and the evaluation of post-release reintegration outcomes.

Implementation of Post-Correctional Criminal Law: Analytical Interpretation

The guidance and supervision mechanisms regulated under Law No. 22 of 2022 and Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 reflect a coherent normative commitment to rehabilitation and reintegration. Deradicalization programs comprising ideological guidance, religious moderation, and vocational training represent a theoretically comprehensive model. However, the prioritization of these strategies entails significant trade-offs. Ideological and security-focused interventions tend to receive greater institutional emphasis due to their alignment with national security objectives, while socio-economic reintegration measures, such as employment facilitation and community-based support, remain underdeveloped. This imbalance reflects a policy bias toward risk mitigation rather than long-term social inclusion.

From a resource perspective, the absence of clearly regulated funding schemes and inter-agency coordination mechanisms creates capacity gaps at the local level. Although legal instruments mandate collaboration among correctional institutions, counterterrorism agencies, and local governments, they do not specify cost-sharing arrangements, implementation benchmarks, or accountability mechanisms. Consequently, the sustainability of reintegration programs is contingent upon institutional initiative rather than systemic design. This finding is grounded in normative document analysis, particularly the lack of technical provisions within the relevant laws and regulations.

Structural and Socio-Legal Barriers: Normative vs. Contextual Insights

Structurally, the legal framework does not provide a detailed allocation of responsibilities among central and local actors, which may lead to fragmented implementation. This conclusion is based on the absence of explicit provisions in statutory and regulatory texts governing operational coordination. In contrast, claims regarding social stigma and reintegration barriers are primarily supported by existing literature rather than direct empirical evidence from

Banyumas. Studies consistently indicate that stigma limits access to employment and social participation, thereby increasing the risk of marginalization (Mustofa, 2021; Schuurman & Bakker, 2021). However, within the scope of this study, such findings are used as contextual reinforcement rather than as case-specific empirical conclusions. The interaction between structural gaps and socio-cultural barriers reveals a critical tension: while legal frameworks emphasize supervision and control, they provide limited instruments for fostering community acceptance and social reconciliation. This imbalance suggests that the realization of restorative justice is constrained not only by regulatory deficiencies but also by the broader socio-legal environment.

Justice Perspectives: Trade-offs and Policy Implications

From a justice perspective, the implementation of post-correctional law involves balancing competing interests between individual rights and collective security. Corrective and restorative justice frameworks offer a normative basis for this balance, emphasizing dignity, proportionality, and community participation. However, the prioritization of security-oriented supervision introduces trade-offs, particularly in the form of intensified monitoring that may risk undermining procedural justice and reinforcing social exclusion. For society, justice is often equated with the absence of risk, leading to policy preferences that favor strict supervision. Yet, such an approach may inadvertently weaken long-term reintegration by limiting opportunities for trust-building and social inclusion. Therefore, a more balanced framework is required one that integrates proportional supervision with community-based reintegration strategies. This includes empowering local actors, fostering participatory governance, and institutionalizing mechanisms for social reconciliation.

Limitations and Transferability

Given that this study employs a normative juridical approach without empirical field data, its conclusions are limited to the analysis of legal frameworks and doctrinal coherence. References to Banyumas Regency function as a regional contextual reference rather than an empirical case, and therefore do not provide direct evidence of implementation outcomes. Consequently, the transferability of findings to other regions must be approached with caution, as local institutional capacity, socio-cultural dynamics, and policy environments may differ significantly. Moreover, the use of

Table 2. Doctrinal Findings of Post-Correctional Criminal Law and Justice Perspectives for Former Terrorism Convicts in Banyumas Regency

Discussion Domain	Key Issues Examined	Normative/Doctrinal Findings	Theoretical Framework	Implications for Policy and Practice
Post-Correctional Criminal Law Implementation	The execution of criminal sanctions following prison release, focusing on guidance and supervision mechanisms for former terrorism convicts.	The regulatory framework provides post-release supervision through integration mechanisms such as parole and conditional leave and recognizes institutional cooperation among correctional authorities and related agencies. However, existing legal instruments do not establish standardized technical guidelines, creating potential variations in implementation across institutions.	Correctional system principles emphasizing social reintegration and rehabilitation.	Strengthening regulatory frameworks and establishing detailed technical guidelines are necessary to ensure greater legal certainty and institutional consistency.
Deradicalization and Reintegration Programs	Strategies aimed at ideological transformation and social reintegration through educational and vocational approaches.	Government Regulation No. 77 of 2019 normatively provides for ideological guidance, religious moderation, and vocational empowerment as components of deradicalization. Nevertheless, the legal framework does not prescribe detailed indicators for evaluating reintegration outcomes or mechanisms for inter-agency coordination and resource allocation.	Rehabilitation theory and preventive counterterrorism strategies.	Developing sustainable and evidence-based deradicalization policies supported by multi-sectoral cooperation is necessary to strengthen reintegration efforts.
Structural and Cultural Reintegration Barriers	Institutional, financial, and socio-cultural factors potentially affecting reintegration processes.	Doctrinal analysis reveals the absence of detailed provisions concerning coordination mechanisms and sustainable funding arrangements. In addition, previous studies indicate that social stigma and limited community acceptance may constitute contextual challenges to reintegration.	Social reintegration theory and stigma theory.	Expanding community-based rehabilitation initiatives and strengthening institutional support mechanisms may contribute to more inclusive reintegration processes.
Justice for Former Convicts (Human Rights Perspective)	Protection of fundamental rights and equitable treatment following sentence completion.	The legal framework recognizes that former convicts retain constitutional rights, including protection of dignity and social participation. However, existing regulations provide limited guidance regarding the balance between supervisory measures and the protection of individual rights.	Corrective justice and restorative justice frameworks.	Policies should ensure proportional supervision and incorporate human rights principles within reintegration strategies.
Justice for Society and Public Security	Balancing reintegration rights with societal interests in maintaining security and public order.	Existing legislation reflects the dual obligation of the state to safeguard public security while facilitating rehabilitation and social reintegration. Community participation is conceptually consistent with restorative justice principles, although specific mechanisms are not comprehensively regulated.	Social defense theory and restorative justice principles.	Encouraging community involvement and strengthening collaborative prevention mechanisms are important to support both security and social cohesion.
Balancing Law Enforcement and Human Rights	Harmonizing criminal law enforcement with humanitarian approaches to reintegration.	Normative analysis indicates that excessive emphasis on security-oriented approaches without corresponding reintegration safeguards may create tensions with human rights principles. Therefore, a holistic and intersectoral approach is required to maintain proportionality between public protection and individual rights.	Human rights-based criminal justice framework.	Legal policies should adopt a balanced approach integrating security concerns, rehabilitation objectives, and human rights standards.

secondary literature to support socio-cultural analysis introduces potential bias, as such sources may not fully

capture localized variations. Future research incorporating empirical methods such as interviews, program evaluations, or

participatory observation would be necessary to validate and extend the normative conclusions presented in this study.

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that while Indonesia's post-correctional legal framework for former terrorism convicts is normatively robust, it remains operationally underdeveloped (see Table 2). The absence of measurable indicators, detailed technical guidelines, and integrated institutional mechanisms limits the realization of substantive justice. At the same time, the prioritization of security-oriented strategies over socio-economic reintegration reflects a structural imbalance that may hinder long-term reintegration outcomes. Addressing these challenges requires not only regulatory reform but also a paradigm shift toward a more holistic, justice-oriented approach that integrates legal certainty, institutional coordination, and social inclusion.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the implementation of post-correctional criminal law for former terrorism convicts in Banyumas Regency reflects a formal administrative and institutional framework involving correctional institutions, law enforcement agencies, the National Counterterrorism Agency, and local government authorities. Post-release supervision and deradicalization programs are normatively regulated and institutionally mandated; however, the analysis demonstrates that the regulatory design lacks detailed operational standards, measurable indicators, and integrated coordination mechanisms. These normative limitations indicate that the legal framework, while structurally established, has not yet been fully articulated into an operational system capable of consistently supporting long-term social reintegration. From a justice perspective, the study finds that the realization of substantive justice remains incomplete. The legal framework formally recognizes principles of rehabilitation, non-discrimination, and reintegration, yet it provides limited normative instruments to ensure their practical fulfillment, particularly in relation to

access to livelihood, proportional supervision, and community participation. At the same time, policy orientation continues to prioritize security considerations, which may create an imbalance between societal protection and the rights of former convicts. This condition reflects a structural tension within the legal system, where restorative and reintegrative justice principles are acknowledged at the normative level but remain underdeveloped in their operationalization.

Conceptually, this study contributes not merely by identifying implementation gaps, but by advancing a normative reinterpretation of post-correctional law through a justice-based indicator framework. By proposing core indicators such as non-discrimination, access to livelihood, proportional supervision, and community participation this research offers a structured lens for evaluating the coherence between legal norms and their intended justice outcomes. This contribution extends existing scholarship, which has largely focused on security and deradicalization, by emphasizing the need for measurable and operational justice parameters within legal design. The recommendations proposed in this study should be understood as strategic and normative propositions derived from the analysis of regulatory frameworks rather than empirically validated performance outcomes. Strengthening cross-sectoral coordination, institutionalizing the role of local governments, and developing community-based reintegration mechanisms are essential directions for policy refinement. In addition, the incorporation of justice-based indicators into legal and policy instruments is necessary to enhance evaluative clarity and accountability. Future research employing empirical approaches is required to assess how these normative proposals operate in practice and to examine their social, economic, and behavioral implications. Finally, this study acknowledges its methodological limitation as a normative juridical inquiry based exclusively on publicly available legal materials. Ethical review was not applicable, as no human subjects, interviews, or field data were involved. Nevertheless, the research adheres to principles of academic integrity through accurate citation, systematic analysis, and objective interpretation of legal sources.

References

- Anisa, I. V., & Syaullah, M. (2023). Wahyu Hidayat's terrorism financing deradicalization strategy. *International Journal of Science and Society*.
- Anwar, U., & Priyatmono, B. (2025). The enforcement of progressive law in Indonesia: In the treatment of terrorist convicts. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 19(2).
- Bayuna, I. W. (2025). A deradicalization policy implementation model for former terrorist convicts in Bengkulu Province. *KnE Social Sciences*, 10, 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v10i30.20330>
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2022). Restorative justice and responsive regulation for serious crime: A normative framework. *Regulation & Governance*, 16(2), 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12345>
- Chaidar, A. (2011). *Terorisme: Perspektif agama, ideologi, dan politik*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Cherrieshta, J., Putri, A. B., & Rasji. (2024). Penguraian Konsep Tanggung Jawab Dalam Filsafat Hukum: Dari Dimensi Individu Ke Masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(8), 570–574. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11108929>
- Cherney, A., & Belton, E. (2021). Managing violent extremism risk through reintegration: Community-based approaches. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 33(5), 1021–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2020.1770655>
- Hutchinson, T. (2023). Doctrinal legal research and the identification of normative gaps: A critical methodological review. *The Law Teacher*, 57(1), 78–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2022.987654>
- Ismed, M. (2021). Deradikalisasi penanganan terorisme secara terintegrasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Legalitas*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.31479/jphl.v15i2.222>
- Lestari, M., Rahman, F., & Putri, A. (2021). Challenges of multi-stakeholder collaboration in offender reintegration under decentralized governance. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 16(4), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-021-09345-6>
- Masithoh, N., Priyanto, S., & Syaullah, M. (2022). Ex-terrorists reintegration programs on conditional release period by Formers Foundation Yayasan Lingkar Perdamaian (YLP). *Journal of Terrorism Studies*, 4(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jts.v4i2.1052>
- Maulana, I., Indriana, D., & Goei, G. (2022). The relevance of high-risk prisons to Indonesia's preventing violent extremism policy. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 16(3).
- McConville, M. (2021). Qualitative normative techniques in legal scholarship: Foundations and applications. *Journal of Legal Research Methodology*, 9(2), 115–138. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jlrm.2021.002>
- McGlynn, C., Westmarland, N., & Godden, N. (2023). Justice, harm, and accountability: Re-thinking responses to serious crime. *Theoretical Criminology*, 27(3), 395–414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13624806221128736>
- Mubaraq, Z. (2022). Return of the lost son: Disengagement and social reintegration of former terrorists in Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2135235>
- Mumtaz JR, H., Saepul Uyun, Y., Rifqi, E., Syarif, N., & Saepullah, U. (2023). ANALISA PENYELESAIAN SENGKETA HAK ASUH ANAK PASCA PERCERAIAN MELALUI LITIGASI. *Jurnal Locus Penelitian Dan Pengabdian*, 2(7), 715–726. <https://doi.org/10.58344/locus.v2i7.1433>
- Mustofa, M. (2021). Stigmatisasi sosial terhadap mantan narapidana terorisme. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 15(1), 89–104.
- Noor, H. (2024). From villain to hero: The role of disengaged terrorists in social reintegration initiatives. *Politics and Governance*, 12, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.7838>
- Prasetyo, D. (2024). Structural limitations in translating legal norms to local correctional practices in Indonesia. *Law and Society Review Indonesia*, 3(1), 22–41.
- Rahmawati, D. E. O. (2025). The Legal Liability of a Notary for the Criminal Act of Forging an Authentic Deed They Created (Judge's Verdict Number 248/Pid.B/2022/PN.Jkt.Bar). *Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies*, 5(12), 14230–14245. <https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v5i12.52037>
- Roach, K. (2021). The 9/11 effect and the globalization of counter-terrorism law: Human rights and normative coherence. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 71(4), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.3138/utlj.71.4>
- Santoso, B., & Wijaya, A. (2023). Multi-actor governance in social reintegration

- programs: The role of Balai Pemasarakatan and local governments. *Journal of Social Development Studies*, 5(2), 89–105.
- Saputro, I. P., Wahyuningsih, S. E., Tampubolon, J. N. A. M., Tanjung, M. Z., & Mirielle, C. Y. (2026). The effects of deradicalization standardized policy in advancing human security. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v6i1.906>
- Schuurman, B., & Bakker, E. (2021). Reintegrating jihadist extremists: Evaluating challenges and policy responses. *Perspectives on Terrorism*.
- Siregar, R. A. (2025). High-risk terrorism inmate deradicalization: A complex and paradoxical issue in Nusakambangan. *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia*, 1(1).
- Tonry, M. (2021). *Excessive punishments: How the justice system creates mass incarceration*. Oxford University Press.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 Tentang Pemasarakatan (2022).
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 1995 Tentang Pemasarakatan (1995).
- Van Hoecke, M. (2021). Statutory interpretation and teleological reasoning in normative legal analysis. *European Journal of Legal Studies*, 14(1), 55–82. <https://doi.org/10.7890/ejls.2021.014>
- Wahab, A. J., Aswin, A., Fakhruddin, M., & Atieqoh, S. (2024). Deradicalization programs in Indonesia: Perspectives of former terrorist convicts. *QIIS (Qudus International Journal of Islamic Studies)*, 12(1), 75–96.
- Wibowo, A. (2023). Normative juridical analysis of criminal punishment execution and post-correctional frameworks in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana Dan Pembangunan*, 5(1), 78–95.