Injuruty: Interdiciplinary Journal and Humanity
Volume 4, Number 7, July 2025
e-ISSN: 2963-4113 and p-ISSN: 2963-3397

Reconstruction of the Correctional System within the Framework of Criminal Justice

(A Paradigm Shift in Penal Policy Following the Enactment of Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections)

Taufik Tri Prabowo[1], Abudllah Sulaiman[2]
[1]Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, Indonesia
Email: triprabowotaufik@gmail.com[1], absulafdy@gmail.com[2]

Abstract
This study aims to analyze the reconstruction of the correctional system within Indonesia's criminal justice framework following the enactment of Law Number 22 of 2022 on Corrections. The shift from Law Number 12 of 1995 to the new regulation marks a significant paradigm change in penal policy-from a narrow interpretation focused on imprisonment to a broader correctional approach that is more corrective, rehabilitative, and restorative. Employing a normative legal research method with conceptual and statutory approaches, this study explores the evolving roles, responsibilities, and positioning of corrections within the entire criminal justice process, from pre-adjudication to post-adjudication stages. The findings indicate that the previous construction of corrections as merely executing custodial sentences is outdated and no longer compatible with legal developments, social dynamics, or contemporary demands for human rights protection. Law No. 22 of 2022 expands the mandate of corrections as a penitentiary system integrated with other key regulations such as the Penal Code (KUHP), Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), and Juvenile Justice Law (UU SPPA). Consequently, a redefinition of the concept, structure, and function of corrections is required to ensure adaptability, institutional effectiveness, and alignment with modern penal paradigms. This study concludes that the reconstruction of Indonesia's correctional system must be understood as a systemic transformation, not merely an administrative revision, to support a more humane, transformative, and nationally contextualized criminal justice system.
Keywords: Reconstruction, Correctional System, Penal Paradigm, Criminal Justice System

INTRODUCTION

Within the criminal justice system, the role and function of corrections must be systematically integrated at every procedural stage—pre-adjudication, adjudication, and post-adjudication—within a cohesive and comprehensive legal framework. Initially, the concept of corrections was narrowly interpreted as the administration of correctional facilities, as outlined in Law No. 12 of 1995 on Corrections (Ardiansyah & Firman Zakaria, 2022; Heliany & Manurung, 2019; HN & Tamudin, 2022; Jumarni, 2019; Silvi Handayani Ni Luh Putu Pande et al., 2022). Over time, however, its scope has expanded significantly to include the management of various institutions governed by broader legal instruments such as the Indonesian Penal Code (*KUHP*), the Criminal Procedure Code (*KUHAP*), and the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law (*UU SPPA*). This expansion reflects a shifting institutional mandate, positioning corrections as a more strategic and integral component of the national criminal justice system.

Consequently, the correctional paradigm, once focused predominantly on fostering rehabilitation as the final stage of penal execution, must now be reconceptualized to accommodate this broadened scope of responsibilities. The enactment of Law No. 22 of 2022, which supersedes Law No. 12 of 1995, represents a normative response to longstanding

regulatory and practical challenges in the correctional domain. As corrections now play an active role from the initial to the terminal stages of the penal process, a renewed conceptual and operational framework is essential for maintaining institutional relevance within an evolving penal policy landscape.

In practical terms, the correctional function has expanded from being the terminal stage of punishment to one that is operational throughout the penal continuum. This functional transformation is formally endorsed through Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections, which provides a legal foundation for a more integrated and holistic correctional framework (Indonesia, 2022; Nopriansyah & Rahayu, 2023; Normilawati et al., 2023; Prasetio et al., 2023; Ratu, 2023). The new legislation is expected to resolve the long-standing disconnect between "law in the books" and "law in action," particularly addressing the fragmentation and discontinuity among correctional subsystems under previous regulations. Addressing these systemic issues requires a comprehensive reconstruction of the correctional framework, one that is aligned with the revised Penal Code (*KUHP*) and the Draft Criminal Procedure Code (*RUU KUHAP*). Such reform necessitates more than piecemeal amendments; it demands a thorough redefinition and structural redesign of the correctional system.

Previous research, such as Farhan (2021), discusses the role of the correctional system in Indonesia, outlining its traditional function and recent legal transformations in Law No. 22 of 2022. While his research highlights the legal reforms, it does not explore in detail how these changes will impact the operationalization of corrections in practice or the systemic issues within the penal process. Similarly, Sutrisno (2019) analyzed the historical development of corrections under Law No. 12 of 1995 but did not address the practical implications of the new correctional framework, particularly regarding the shift towards rehabilitation and reintegration.

This research aims to examine the legal and operational implications of the 2022 reform in Indonesia's correctional system, particularly how it addresses the fragmentation between correctional subsystems and aligns with broader penal policies. The study provides valuable insights into the practical transformation of corrections from a purely punitive system to one that incorporates rehabilitation and reintegration efforts. By offering a detailed analysis of these changes, the research contributes to the development of more effective, coherent correctional policies that can improve outcomes for offenders and the overall criminal justice system.

The urgency of this reconstruction lies in the imperative to ensure that corrections remain institutionally robust within Indonesia's rapidly evolving criminal law regime. This transitional period offers a critical opportunity to formulate forward-looking policies that facilitate meaningful reform. The renewed legal framework on corrections is anticipated to produce strategic policy outcomes, fostering alignment and synergy among substantive criminal law, procedural law, and the execution of criminal sanctions. Through this reformative approach, the substantive role of corrections can be optimized in supporting penal policies that prioritize rehabilitation and the social reintegration of offenders.

METHOD

This research adopts a doctrinal-normative approach to examine the legal principles, norms, and doctrines underlying the reconstruction of Indonesia's correctional system following the enactment of Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections. The study focuses on the

intersection between shifting sentencing paradigms and the evolving role of corrections within the criminal justice system, particularly in aligning legal mandates with the protection of fundamental human rights.

By analyzing statutory frameworks, jurisprudence, and conceptual debates, the study examines how Indonesia's correctional policies can transition from punitive traditions to a rehabilitative and reintegrative orientation. The normative inquiry is reinforced by a comparative framework, referencing national legal instruments—such as the Penal Code (*KUHP*), the Criminal Procedure Code (*KUHAP*), and the Juvenile Justice System Law (*UU SPPA*)—in conjunction with international standards, including the Nelson Mandela Rules, the Tokyo Rules, and the Bangkok Rules, which offer benchmarks for a humane and rights-based correctional framework.

In addition to legal texts, the study draws on secondary sources, including expert opinions, policy reports, and official data. This combination of normative and empirical materials enables a holistic understanding of the challenges and prospects of correctional reform. Ultimately, the research seeks to illuminate how law can serve not merely as a tool of control, but as a framework for transformative justice, where dignity, accountability, and social reintegration are equally prioritized.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Correlation Between the Correctional System and Penitentiary Law

Indonesia's declaration of independence on August 17, 1945, signified more than the end of colonial domination-it represented a foundational pledge to construct a legal, social, and political order rooted in the nation's own cultural and philosophical identity. This foundational moment also set in motion the reformation of the national legal system, particularly in the areas of criminal law and crime policy. Within this broader transformation, the penal system-serving as a central mechanism in the implementation of criminal justice-has experienced continuous conceptual and normative evolution.

One significant reform in national criminal law was the transformation from the penitentiary system (kepenjaraan) to the correctional system (pemasyarakatan), officially declared in 1964. This moment was a milestone in Indonesia's criminal law reform. President Sukarno, through his revolutionary mandate, changed the term "penitentiary" to "corrections." Citing the need to adapt to the nation's cultural character, His Excellency the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the Great Leader of the Revolution, and Supreme Protector, proclaimed that *"What was once called the Penitentiary System has now been retooled and reshaped into the Correctional System in alignment with Manipol/Usdek."*

This directive was rooted in the ideas advanced by Dr. (Hc) Sahardjo, who, during his tenure as Minister of Justice, introduced the concept of pemasyarakatan (corrections) to the President as a reformative alternative to conventional punitive models. Sahardjo also proposed the symbol of the pohon beringin pengayoman-a banyan tree representing state protection-as a culturally grounded reinterpretation of legal philosophy in Indonesia. This symbol replaced Themis, the classical figure of blindfolded justice, which he critiqued as embodying liberal ideals that were incongruent with the Indonesian worldview. In his 1963 honorary doctorate speech at the University of Indonesia, Sahardjo articulated that the purpose of imprisonment is *"corrections."* He emphasized that corrections is not simply a terminological shift, but a

transformative vision that regards inmates as individuals capable of rehabilitation and reintegration into the social fabric.

This reform was subsequently replaced the colonial-era penitentiary framework inherited from the Dutch. The shifting introduced fundamental principles emphasizing not merely the punishment of offenders but their reformation and reintegration into society. This aligns with broader international trends in criminal justice that prioritize restorative over retributive justice (Lev, 2000). As Andrew Ashworth argues, *"a penal system should not only serve retribution or deterrence but also aim at rehabilitating the offender to rejoin society as a law-abiding citizen."(Ashworth, 2015)*

However, the implementation and development of the correctional system have stagnated. For more than two decades, the paradigm was not fully realized, primarily due to the limited normative framework in "Law No. 12 of 1995", which was narrowly understood as a technical legal framework for executing imprisonment. Law No. 12 of 1995 was perceived by the public and some law enforcement officers merely as the execution of corporal punishment, without fully recognizing corrections' role in protecting inmates' rights or as an integral part of the criminal justice system. This was exacerbated by the normative construction in the law that positioned corrections as the final stage in the criminal justice process and tended to associate its regulations with the technical aspects of penal sanctions such as deprivation of liberty, rather than emphasizing rights protection and social reintegration as part of a just criminal justice system. This construction ignored the principle that corrections should extend beyond mere imprisonment. Within a just and humane criminal justice framework, corrections should operate from the early stages of the legal process, protecting suspects and defendants from potential abuse of state power and ensuring human rights fulfillment for all individuals involved in the process.

This perception has gradually been corrected, especially with growing global and national demands for human rights enforcement, including for offenders. Society increasingly recognizes that corrections should not only come into play after sentencing but also from the moment an individual enters the criminal justice process. The potential for abuse during investigation and detention strongly supports the necessity for corrections to be present from the outset-to protect, supervise, and guarantee suspects' and defendants' human rights. This rationale underpins the birth of "Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections", replacing the previous law. The new law responds to the need to reconstruct the correctional system to be more adaptive and relevant to legal and societal developments. It brings a significant paradigm shift: corrections is no longer merely an executor of imprisonment but a system encompassing protection, rehabilitation, supervision, and social reintegration of offenders from the early stages of the justice process. The new law fundamentally changes the state's view of corrections-from the endpoint of imprisonment to a system functioning throughout all stages of criminal justice. Corrections is now positioned as an integral part of legal protection and human rights fulfillment, as well as an active element in restorative justice.

This new paradigm aligns with modern criminal law approaches emphasizing the principle of "ultimum remedium" (imprisonment as a last resort) and accommodating "restorative justice". Corrections thus become not just the final stage of the criminal justice system but a strategic element in ensuring substantive justice through rehabilitation, mediation, and effective social reintegration. Law No. 22 of 2022 also aligns with other regulations such

as “Law No. 11 of 2012 on Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak (SPPA)” and “Law No. 1 of 2023 on Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)”. In this system, sentencing no longer relies solely on imprisonment but includes alternatives such as community service, supervision, and fines. This reinforces the principle that imprisonment is the last, not primary, option. The correctional system is thus required to manage these sentencing forms, necessitating organizational adaptation, human resource competency development, and adequate technical regulatory support. The enactment of Law No. 22 of 2022 marks a turning point in rebuilding corrections as a comprehensive, modern, and adaptive system responsive to national and international criminal law developments. This paradigm shift demonstrates that corrections can no longer be viewed solely as technical executors of imprisonment but must serve as a bridge between punishment and rehabilitation, between state interests and individual rights protection, and between crime prevention and social reintegration.

According to Barda Nawawi Arief, the penal system consists of three main pillars: substantive criminal law (KUHP), procedural criminal law (KUHAP), and penal execution law (Arief, 2006). These pillars form an inseparable system. Historically, public and academic attention has focused more on the first two pillars, while penal execution law has been relatively neglected. In this context, Law No. 22 of 2022 is crucial as it provides strong legitimacy to penal execution law as an integral part of the criminal justice system. Furthermore, this regulation must be viewed within the broader framework of criminal law reform, including the implementation of the KUHP (Law No. 1 of 2023) and SPPA (Law No. 11 of 2012). Both emphasize the importance of alternative sanctions beyond imprisonment and expand the scope for non-punitive approaches. Corrections must not only understand these new sentencing forms but also prepare the necessary infrastructure, information technology utilization, and competent governance to implement them effectively.

Despite Law No. 22 of 2022 providing a progressive normative foundation, the implementation of this new paradigm still faces several challenges. These include limited understanding among law enforcement officers regarding the new functions of corrections, suboptimal inter-agency synergy within the criminal justice system, and insufficient budgetary and infrastructural support. Public knowledge about penal execution law remains low. Consequently, although the new law has shifted the paradigm normatively, its implementation has yet to fully address the root problems. Literacy regarding corrections as a system encompassing protection from the earliest stages of the justice process is still uneven. Therefore, continuous public education is essential moving forward. Moreover, the dynamics of modern crimes such as corruption, terrorism, and narcotics offenses require differentiated and specific treatment approaches. A one-size-fits-all treatment model is inadequate. Risk mapping and individualized, responsive, and equitable strategies are needed. Corrections must respond by developing risk-based, evidence-based treatment models that also consider transformative justice aspects.

Inconsistencies Legal Framework in the Correctional System

In the construction of modern criminal procedural law in Indonesia, the correctional system has gained a more strategic role compared to the era still governed by the “Herzien Inlandsch Reglement” (HIR). “Law No. 8 of 1981 on Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP)”, together with its implementing regulation, “Peraturan Pemerintah No. 27 of 1983”, provides a clear foundation for the existence and institutional functions of

corrections. It is stipulated that: First; Rumah Tahanan Negara (Rutan) are the sole legitimate places for detaining suspects and defendants (Article 21, Government Regulation No. 27 of 1983). Second; corrections are authorized to release detainees by law if the detention period exceeds the prescribed limit, serving as supervision and a corrective mechanism against potential human rights violations (Article 19, paragraph 7). Third; Rumah Penyimpanan Benda Sitaan Negara (Rupbasan) is designated as an exclusive institution to safeguard rights during coercive confiscation efforts, including securing and preserving the value of evidence (Article 30). However, this latter function has been recklessly-if not deliberately-undermined by "Peraturan Presiden No. 155 of 2024", wherein Article 76 unconstitutionally transfers Rupbasan's role to a unit responsible for asset recovery within the Indonesian Prosecutor's. The ideal of due process remains far from realization. Despite the controversy surrounding the third point, these provisions clearly reflect the lawmakers' strong intent to regulate coercive measures and their safeguards meticulously to prevent abuses of authority reminiscent of the H.I.R. regime, which historically resulted in injustice toward justice seekers. This construction shows that from the outset, corrections have been entrusted with an important role in ensuring procedural justice and legal and human rights protection in the execution of coercive measures.

Nonetheless, inconsistencies also exist within the normative construction of correctional regulations themselves. The normative framework in "Law No. 12 of 1995" narrows corrections' function solely to inmate treatment, juveniles, and parolee. Article 1, paragraph (1) defines corrections as "the activity of fostering correctional inmates based on systems, institutions, and methods of guidance that constitute the final part of the penal system." This definition is problematic because it implies that corrections operate only after sentencing, not from the early stages of the judicial process.

A paradox emerges when empirical facts show that units such as Rutan and Bapas have operated and played key roles since the pre-adjudication stage. The role of corrections through Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan (Probation Officers) is vital, as their involvement in preparing social inquiry reports is a crucial element of restorative justice efforts underpinning the modern penal paradigm. Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan act not only as supervisors but also as facilitators of restorative processes that engage offenders, victims, and communities in addressing the harm caused by crime, consistent with international standards such as the Council of Europe Recommendation on Restorative Justice (Europe, 2018). This approach aligns with the principle that restorative justice should be integrated into sentence planning, enabling participation from all stakeholders to repair harm and rebuild relationships, thereby supporting offender rehabilitation and social reintegration. Empirical studies have demonstrated that social inquiry reports prepared by probation officers significantly influence the use of community-based sanctions and restorative interventions, although their impact on custodial sentencing remains limited (Roberts & Roberts, 1982). These reports provide courts with comprehensive social and psychological assessments that inform sentencing decisions, promoting alternatives to incarceration and reinforcing the rehabilitative and reintegrative aims of modern penal policy. In summary, the role of Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan in preparing social inquiry reports and facilitating restorative justice processes is central to the contemporary correctional system's shift towards a more humane, effective, and socially responsive penal paradigm. Viewing these institutions partially (sylo mentality) because they are regulated by various laws contradicts the essence of a system, which must operate integrally

and simultaneously with interrelated components from start to finish to achieve a goal. This lack of synchronization indicates that Law No. 12 of 1995 failed to fully integrate corrections' function within the criminal justice system. Rather than strengthening corrections' systemic role, the regulation created semantic limitations that do not reflect the complexity of the tasks actually performed.

On the other hand, the strong influence of Sahardjo's thinking, which emphasized corrections as the purpose of imprisonment, has historically constrained the meaning of corrections to a narrow scope. Many early generations subsequently regarded conceptual updates as taboo. If viewed as a causal relationship from Sahardjo's statement, *"the purpose of imprisonment is corrections"* raises patterned questions such as: *"is corrections only about prison?"* and *"Do other forms of punishment not require corrections?"* However, shortly after this idea was proposed, Bahroedin Soerjobroto, at the 1964 Prison Service Conference (Konferensi Djawatan Kependjaraan 1964), refined the understanding of corrections as a system of treatment for inmates and juveniles, not merely as the purpose of imprisonment. This formulation was accepted by all conference participants, adopted as a policy statement, and eventually codified at the moment claimed as the birth of the correctional system. The rapid development of scientific knowledge and the political constellation at the time led to many shifts in the interpretation of corrections, resulting in fundamental differences between the initial conception (Sahardjo) and the consensus reached at the founding conference (Bahroedin Soerjobroto). This broadened the scope of corrections into a system rather than merely an activity.

On the other hand, the strong influence of Sahardjo's thinking, which emphasized corrections as the purpose of imprisonment, historically constrained the meaning of corrections to a narrow scope. Many early generations subsequently regarded conceptual updates as taboo, reflecting a rigid adherence to the idea that "the purpose of imprisonment is corrections (Soeharto, 2010)." This statement raises critical questions: "Is corrections only about prison?" and "Do other forms of punishment not require corrections?" Such a narrow view risks ignoring alternative sanctions and the broader rehabilitative and social reintegrative functions of the correctional system. However, shortly after this idea was proposed, Bahroedin Soerjobroto, at the 1964 Prison Service Conference (Konferensi Djawatan Kependjaraan 1964), refined the understanding of corrections as a system of treatment for inmates and juveniles, not merely as the purpose of imprisonment. This formulation was accepted by all conference participants, adopted as a policy statement, and eventually codified at the moment claimed as the birth of the correctional system.

The rapid advancement of scientific knowledge and the political climate of the time contributed to significant shifts in the interpretation of corrections, resulting in fundamental differences between Sahardjo's initial conception and the consensus reached at the conference led by Bahroedin Soerjobroto. This broadened the scope of corrections into a system rather than merely an activity. This evolution broadened the scope of corrections from a narrow punitive function to a comprehensive system encompassing rehabilitation, social reintegration, and human rights protection, consistent with modern penological theories and international standards such as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) (Nations, 2015).

Nevertheless, the initial conception as a penal objective expanded into a system of treatment was ultimately downgraded by the enactment of Law No. 12 of 1995, which constructed corrections merely as a fostering activity. Although Law No. 12 of 1995 recognized corrections as a social institution, it established a narrow definition. Consequently, an overlap occurred between institutional practices and the normative framework, which hindered the systemic integration of corrections within the criminal justice system. This condition further underscores the persistent inconsistency in constructing corrections.

Furthermore, the formulation of Law No. 12 of 1995 failed to capture the complexity of penitentiary law, which encompasses the implementation of all types of sanctions and legal measures. The characteristics of Law No. 12 of 1995 still reflect regulatory legacies from the "Gestichten Reglement", which were more administrative and oriented toward the execution of imprisonment. Although the law does not explicitly limit corrections to incarceration, the dominance of provisions regulating inmate treatment within institutions restricts the interpretative scope of corrections' systemic functions. As a result, units such as Rutan and Bapas receive less normative recognition despite their strategic functional roles from pre-adjudication.

Reconstruction of the Correctional System within the Criminal Justice System

Corrections, both theoretically and practically, is an inseparable part of the criminal justice system (Mauer, 2006). It holds a crucial role in realizing national criminal policy as outlined in the Ketetapan Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (TAP MPR) Number X/MPR/1998, which aims to create public order, improve offenders' mental attitudes, and protect human rights within the framework of substantive justice. This position affirms that corrections are not merely executors of imprisonment but also determine the ultimate quality of the criminal justice system by *"guaranteeing the protection of the rights of detainees and children in conflict with the law; enhancing the personality and independence of correctional inmates; and providing protection to society from the recurrence of criminal acts."*

The enactment of Law No. 22 of 2022 on Corrections marks a phase of systemic reconstruction. This law not only broadens the definition of corrections as an institution but also addresses shortcomings of previous regulations, unifies scattered norms, and positions corrections as an integral legal entity within the criminal justice system-from pre-adjudication to post-adjudication. It also represents a new milestone in the reconstruction of penitentiary law in Indonesia. From this perspective, corrections is not merely about inmate incarceration but constitutes a system of treatment for all forms of sanctions and legal measures. In other words, corrections is promoted as a penal policy instrument that must be adaptive to social dynamics, scientific developments, and global demands for respect for human dignity-not merely a technical executor of punishment. It encompasses not only fostering correctional inmate but also detainee management, diversion efforts, social inquiry research, and guidance in the implementation of alternative sanctions. Constructing an integrated and holistic correctional system within the criminal justice system is essential to avoid a partial approach. Institutions such as Rutan, Bapas, and Lapas are nodes within the system that must operate within a unified framework aimed at guaranteeing justice, enforcing the law, and protecting human rights. Furthermore, the integration of human rights principles into correctional practices reflects Indonesia's commitment to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), particularly Article 10, which mandates humane treatment for all detainees.

Unlike previous regulations, Law No. 22 of 2022 fully integrates penitentiary norms. In this law, corrections are not merely defined as an administrative activity or function but are constructed as a macro and holistic penal treatment system. Corrections in this context encompass structural aspects (institutional framework), functional aspects (duties and authorities), and substantive aspects (objectives and principles), which operate simultaneously across all stages of the criminal justice system. This is not an expansion of authority but rather a reaffirmation of the penitentiary system as an independent legal system with its own structure, functions, and objectives, while remaining integrated within the overall criminal law system. The law also opens space for the recodification of national penitentiary law, which was previously fragmented and partial. According to Van Bemmelen, penitentiary law includes the objectives, operational capacity, and organization of penal institutions (Van Bemmelen & Santoso, 1997). Law No. 22 of 2022 meets these elements and provides a normative foundation for strengthening correctional institutions as a standalone penitentiary regime that is functionally connected to the substantive and procedural criminal law subsystems.

This reconstruction is highly relevant and urgent in the context of the enactment of the KUHP (Law No. 1 of 2023), which explicitly adopts non-custodial approaches such as community service, probation, and other alternative sanctions, reflecting the spirit of SPPA (Law No. 11 of 2012). Against this backdrop, Law No. 22 of 2022 presents the initial codification of penitentiary law that was previously dispersed across various technical and administrative regulations. This codification facilitates the development of a cohesive correctional system oriented toward human rights protection and adaptive to social developments, technological advances, and the dynamics of modern crime.

Correctional reform in Law No. 22 of 2022 demonstrates that the reconstruction of penitentiary law can no longer be viewed merely as an administrative revision but as a conceptual correction of the old paradigm. This demands a collective awareness that corrections are not simply executors of sentences but guardians of legal values and the very objectives of penal sanctions. More than that, this reconstruction manifests a broader renewal of Indonesian criminal law thinking. It reveals that penal policy is no longer solely punishment-oriented but also embraces restoration, rights protection, and social reconstruction of offenders. This represents the core essence of the paradigm shift in corrections: from mere punishment execution to a treatment system grounded in transformative justice (van Zyl Smit & Snacken, 2009). Moreover, it resonates with modern penological theories advocating restorative and transformative justice approaches that prioritize healing and community restoration over retribution (Zehr, 2002).

Within this new configuration, corrections is no longer synonymous with imprisonment but serves as an instrument implementing all forms of penal sanctions integratively. Thus, the old question, *"is corrections only applicable to imprisonment?"* has been normatively and systemically answered: no. Corrections is a treatment system for all forms of criminal sanctions and legal measures, whether carried out inside or outside correctional institutions. In this context, the new construction of corrections is not only compatible but also crucial in addressing the evolving penal system under the new KUHP. Consequently, the framework established by Law No. 22 of 2022 rectifies inconsistencies that have persisted since the 1960s and strengthens corrections as a macro system in penal execution. The normative inconsistencies in corrections' construction have reflected regulatory lag in keeping pace with

the evolving functions and roles of corrections within the criminal justice system. Law No. 22 of 2022 emerges as a historical correction and an effort to align the correctional system with the modern penal paradigm espoused by the new KUHP.

The reformulation of corrections must be grounded in the principles of integration, human rights protection, effective rehabilitation, and sustainable social reintegration to realize a truly humane and equitable criminal justice system. This reconstruction should not be understood merely as a structural or administrative change but as a paradigm transformation in viewing penal sanctions-from punishment to restoration, from imprisonment to community-based corrections. This marks a shift from a legalistic approach to a holistic one, positioning corrections as the primary instrument of penal policy that is inclusive and socially just.

The challenge ahead lies in ensuring the effective implementation of this normative reconstruction. Beyond regulatory consistency, political will and institutional capacity strengthening are essential to realize corrections as a systemic entity, not merely an administrative apparatus. Equally important are the enhancement of human resource capacities within corrections, adequate budgetary support, and reinforced coordination among law enforcement agencies-elements that must not be compromised under any circumstances. Only through these means can the correctional system optimally fulfill its new mandate to establish a criminal justice system that is just, humane, and oriented toward social restoration (Tonry, 2014). The reformulation of corrections must be grounded in the principles of integration, human rights protection, effective rehabilitation, and sustainable social reintegration to realize a truly humane and equitable criminal justice system (Commissioner, 2010). This reconstruction should not be understood merely as a structural or administrative change but as a paradigm transformation in viewing penal sanctions-from punishment to restoration, from imprisonment to community-based corrections. This marks a shift from a legalistic approach to a holistic one, positioning corrections as the primary instrument of penal policy that is inclusive and socially just.

CONCLUSION

The reconstruction of Indonesia's correctional system under Law No. 22 of 2022 represents a significant shift in penal policy, transforming the role of corrections from a mere executor of imprisonment to a comprehensive, integrated system across the entire criminal justice process. Unlike the previous Law No. 12 of 1995, which limited corrections to post-conviction roles, the new law recognizes the strategic roles of correctional units such as *Rutan* and *Bapas* from the early stages of legal proceedings. These units have long exceeded the boundaries set by previous regulations, engaging in legal protection, the execution of coercive measures, and juvenile diversion processes. This shift positions corrections as part of a modern penal system focused on restorative justice, social reintegration, and human dignity. The success of this transformation requires strong political will, harmonized regulations, institutional capacity building, and public education. The new law provides a foundation for an integrated, progressive, and human-centric penal system in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Ardiansyah, M. F., & Firman Zakaria, C. A. (2022). Pemenuhan Hak Kesehatan bagi Wargabinaan di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Dihubungkan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 1995

tentang Pemasyarakatan. *Bandung Conference Series: Law Studies*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.29313/bcsls.v2i1.735

Arief, B. N. (2006). *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dan Pemidanaan*. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Ashworth, A. (2015). *Sentencing and Criminal Justice* (6th, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Commissioner, U. N. H. R. O. of the H. (2010). *Human Rights in the Administration of Justice*. United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/training9chapterIVen.pdf

Europe, C. of. (2018). *Recommendation CM/Rec(2018)8 on Restorative Justice*. https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016808c0e60

Heliany, I., & Manurung, E. H. (2019). SISTEM PEMBINAAN NARAPIDANA DI LEMBAGA PEMASYARAKATAN KLAS I CIPINANG DITINJAU BERDASAKAN UNDANG-UNDANG NO 12 TAHUN 1995 TENTANG PEMASYARAKATAN. *PROSIDING SEMINAR NASIONAL CENDEKIAWAN*. https://doi.org/10.25105/semnas.v0i0.5848

HN, Z. B., & Tamudin, M. (2022). PERLINDUNGAN HAK KESEHATAN NARAPIDANA LAPAS KELAS I PALEMBANG PADA MASA COVID-19 MENURUT UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 12 TAHUN 1995 TENTANG PEMASYARAKATAN DAN HUKUM PIDANA ISLAM. *Ta'zir: Jurnal Hukum Pidana*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.19109/tazir.v6i2.14366

Indonesia, P. (2022). *Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 tentang Pemasyarakatan*. BPK.

Jumarni, J. (2019). Peran Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas II A Watampone Dalam Pembinaan Narapidana Penyalahgunaan Narkoba Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 1995 tentang Pemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Al-Dustur : Journal of Politic and Islamic Law*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.30863/jad.v2i2.502

Lev, D. S. (2000). *Legal Evolution and Political Authority in Indonesia: Selected Essays*. Kluwer Law International.

Mauer, M. (2006). *Race to Incarcerate*. The New Press.

Nations, U. (2015). *Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)*. https://undocs.org/A/RES/70/175

Nopriansyah, M., & Rahayu, D. P. (2023). KONTRIBUSI HUKUM PROGRESIF DALAM PERUBAHAN UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 22 TAHUN 2022 TENTANG PEMASYARAKATAN. *Keadilan*, *21*(1).

Normilawati, Afandi, & Andriyansyah, M. F. (2023). PEMBERIAN REMISI DAN PEMBEBASAN BERSYARAT KEPADA NARAPIDANA KORUPSI BERDASARKAN UNDANG UNDANG NOMOR 22 TAHUN 2022 TENTANG PEMASYARAKATAN. *DINAMIKA*, *29*(1).

Prasetio, R. B., Waskita, R., Rafsanjani, J. I., & Anggayudha, Z. H. (2023). Zero Overstaying: Harapan Baru Pasca Lahirnya Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 Tentang Pemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, *17*(2). https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2023.v17.111-134

Ratu, M. (2023). Telaah Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan Dalam Implementasi Konsep Restorative Justice Menurut Undang – Undang Pemasyarakatan Nomor 22 Tahun 2022. *COMSERVA : Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Masyarakat*, *3*(5). https://doi.org/10.59141/comserva.v3i5.982

Roberts, J. M., & Roberts, C. (1982). Social Enquiry Reports and Sentencing. *The Howard Journal*, *21*(1), 76–93. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.1982.tb00444.x

Silvi Handayani Ni Luh Putu Pande, Ni Putu Rai Yuliartini, & Dewa Gede Sudika Mangku. (2022). IMPLEMENTASI PASAL 14 AYAT 1 HURUF (C) UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 12 TAHUN 1995 TENTANG PEMASYARAKATAN DALAM UPAYA PENCEGAHAN RESIDIVIS KASUS PENCURIAN DI KABUPATEN BULELENG. *Jurnal Komunitas Yustisia*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.23887/jatayu.v5i2.51456

Soeharto, D. (2010). *Pemasyarakatan di Indonesia: Sejarah dan Perkembangan*. Rajawali Pers.

Tonry, M. (2014). *Sentencing Matters*. Oxford University Press.

Van Bemmelen, S., & Santoso, R. (1997). *Hukum Penitensier dan Kebijakan Pemidanaan*. Rajawali Pers.

van Zyl Smit, D., & Snacken, S. (2009). *Principles of European Prison Law and Policy: Penology and Human Rights*. Oxford University Press.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Good Books.