

Reclaiming Freedom, Forgiveness, And The Paradox Of Access Denied: A Conceptual Analysis Of Post-

Exoneration Reentry

Dr Arinaitwe Julius

Metropolitan International University

Abstract

Exoneration-the formal legal recognition that a person was wrongfully convicted and was innocent of the crime for which they were imprisoned-should, in principle, represent the full restoration of freedom, status, and social belonging. In practice, it frequently represented something far more ambiguous: a legal declaration of innocence that coexists with persistent social stigma, absent institutional support, unaddressed psychological trauma, and in many jurisdictions the continued imposition of collateral consequences that were triggered by the original wrongful conviction and that state law has not automatically removed upon exoneration. This conceptual and qualitative study examined the post-exoneration reentry experience through the lens of three intersecting concepts-freedom, forgiveness, and access arguing that the exoneree's experience reveals with particular clarity a paradox that also, in different forms, characterizes the experience of the broader post-incarceration population: the paradox of being told one was free while systemic structures deny the practical content of freedom. Drawing on in-depth interviews with 24 exonerees recruited through innocence project organisations, the study employed critical phenomenological analysis and conceptual argumentation to illuminate the specific dimensions of post-exoneration access denial. Findings reveal that exonerees navigate a social and institutional landscape that is largely unprepared for their existence: legal frameworks that restore their formal innocence without restoring their concrete life circumstances, social environments that were uncertain how to respond to a category of experience most people have never encountered, and psychological burdens including complex trauma, identity disruption, and grief for which specialised therapeutic support is rarely available or funded. The study proposed a conceptual framework the Freedom-Forgiveness-Access (FFA) triad for understanding the post-exoneration condition and identified the policy and institutional reforms necessary to give the legal act of exoneration the substance that justice requires.

Keywords: Exoneration, Wrongful Conviction, Post-Exoneration Reentry, Freedom, Forgiveness, Access Denied, Innocence Projects, Reentry Justice, Conceptual Framework, Criminal Justice Reform, Trauma, Identity

Introduction

The word "exoneration" carries an extraordinary moral and legal weight. To be exonerated is to be declared, by the authority of the state, not guilty to have the wrong of wrongful conviction officially acknowledged and formally reversed. For the public, exoneration stories are narratives of triumph: the innocent person finally freed, justice finally

Received: 14.09.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

served, the system's error finally corrected (Julius & Desire, 2025). The moment of release from prison following exoneration has become a cultural image—the blinking individual emerging into sunlight, embraced by weeping family members, speaking to a cluster of cameras and microphones about the years they have lost and the freedom they have finally regained (Jac & Kazaara, 2023).

What these images do not typically show is what happens next. The cameras leave. The family members go home. The lawyers return to their offices. The exoneree is left standing in a world that has moved on without them—often for many years, sometimes for decades with a legal declaration of innocence in their hand and, in most cases, very little else. No guaranteed compensation (Julius, Nancy, et al., 2026). No automatic record expungement. No housing or employment support. No psychological care for the trauma of wrongful incarceration. And in many states, no automatic removal of the collateral consequences—the employment bars, the housing restrictions, the licence revocations that the original wrongful conviction triggered and that remain embedded in administrative databases, background check systems, and professional licensing records long after the exoneration certificate has been issued (Lestari, 2020).

The National Registry of Exonerations (2024) documents over 3,400 exonerations in the United States since 1989, with an average of approximately 200 per year in recent years as the work of innocence projects, conviction review units, and advancing forensic science continues to surface cases of wrongful conviction (Julius, Sarah, et al., 2026). These numbers represent not only a significant ongoing justice issue but a substantial and growing population of individuals navigating the specific and under addressed challenge of post-exoneration reentry—a challenge that differs from ordinary post-incarceration reentry in ways that the scholarship and policy landscape have only recently begun to appreciate (Julius & Audrey, 2026).

The specific difference that distinguishes post-exoneration reentry from post-incarceration reentry in general is the dimension of innocence. The formerly incarcerated individual who has served a legitimate sentence for an offence they committed must navigate reentry carrying the moral and practical weight of having done what they were convicted of doing. The exoneree must navigate reentry carrying the moral weight of having been wronged by the state in a manner that destroyed years of their life through no fault of their own (Julius & Kazaara, 2026b).

The FFA triad: freedom, forgiveness, and access — a conceptual framework

Freedom: Formal and Substantive

The concept of freedom in the post-exoneration context reveals an instructive distinction between formal and substantive freedom that political philosophers have long debated but that the exoneree's experience renders with

Received: 14.09.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

unusual clarity and urgency (Berlin, 1969; Sen, 1999). Formal freedom is the absence of legal prohibition-the state's recognition that one is no longer subject to the constraints of incarceration or supervised release. Substantive freedom is the actual capacity to live as a free person to work, to form and sustain relationships, to participate in community, to exercise the practical capabilities that a dignified human life requires (Faith et al., 2023). Exoneration restores formal freedom immediately and completely: the moment the exoneree walks out of prison, they are in law an innocent person with the full rights of any citizen. Substantive freedom is another matter entirely, and the data gathered for this study document in vivid and painful detail how far the exoneree's experience of substantive freedom typically falls short of what formal freedom implies (Julius & Audrey, 2025).

Forgiveness: The Anomalous Moral Position of the Exoneree

Forgiveness, in the standard relational ethics framework, flows from the wronged party toward the party that wronged them. In the post-incarceration context for guilty individuals, this framework applies straightforwardly: victims may or may not extend forgiveness to those who harmed them, and the formerly incarcerated individual occupies the role of the person who wronged and who must seek or wait for forgiveness. For the exoneree, however, the moral geometry of forgiveness is radically inverted. The exoneree is the party that was wronged by the criminal justice system, by witnesses who testified falsely, by prosecutors who withheld evidence, by police who manufactured or mishandled evidence, and by a jury that convicted on the basis of flawed information (Julius, Audrey, et al., 2026). The forgiveness question for the exoneree is not whether they will be forgiven but whether they can extend forgiveness and to whom, and on what terms, and what that forgiveness means for their psychological recovery and social reintegration. This conceptual point has significant practical implications. Standard reentry programming to the extent that it addresses forgiveness at all is designed for people in the role of offender seeking forgiveness, not for people in the role of victim considering whether to forgive a system that destroyed years of their lives (Julius & Kazaara, 2026a). Exonerees placed in standard reentry programming find themselves in deeply incoherent conceptual territory, being offered frameworks and language that do not fit their moral position and that, in some cases, actively compound their distress by positioning them as recipients of mercy rather than as individuals to whom justice is owed.

Access: The Third Pillar

The access dimension of the FFA triad refers to the practical capacity to participate in the social, economic, and relational domains of free life. For exonerees, access denial operates across multiple simultaneous dimensions that together constitute a comprehensive practical exclusion from the substantive content of freedom (Vincent & Peter, 2023). Employment access is denied through the persistence of wrongful conviction records in background check databases that have not been updated to reflect exoneration. Housing access is constrained by landlords who conduct background checks and who may not be required by law to distinguish between a conviction and an exonerated

Received: 14.09.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

wrongful conviction. Professional licensing access is blocked in many jurisdictions by automatic revocation provisions that were triggered by the original conviction and that require expensive, time-consuming legal proceedings to reverse. Social access is limited by the stigma of having been incarcerated, which persists in community perception even when the fact of innocence is known, because the social categories through which people process incarceration history do not comfortably accommodate the category of exoneree.

Literature Review

The Wrongful Conviction Landscape

Scholarship on wrongful conviction has expanded dramatically since the establishment of the first innocence project in 1992, driven by the accumulation of DNA-based exonerations that demonstrated the scale and systematic character of wrongful conviction in the American criminal justice system. Gross and Risinger (2012) estimated that at least 4.1% of individuals sentenced to death are innocent—a figure that, extrapolated to the broader prison population, suggests wrongful conviction numbers in the tens of thousands. The primary identified contributors to wrongful conviction eyewitness misidentification, false confessions, informant testimony, forensic science errors, and official misconduct have each generated substantial scholarly literatures that have informed legal reform and policy change (Garrett, 2011; Innocence Project, 2024).

Post-Exoneration Experience: What We Know

The post-exoneration reentry literature, while smaller than the wrongful conviction scholarship that preceded it, has documented a consistent set of challenges that exonerees face upon release. Campbell and Denov (2004), in an early qualitative study of 18 Canadian exonerees, identified emotional and psychological distress, identity disruption, relationship difficulties, and employment barriers as primary post-exoneration challenges. Wildeman et al. (2011) documented the economic consequences of wrongful incarceration, finding that exonerees' earnings trajectories showed persistent negative effects of wrongful imprisonment that extended far beyond release. Westervelt and Cook (2012), in what remains the most comprehensive qualitative study of U.S. exonerees, documented the multiple domains of post-exoneration struggle including financial devastation, psychological trauma, family disruption, and the specific challenge of navigating a social world that had no coherent category for the person they had become.

Gaps in the Literature

Despite this growing scholarship, several significant gaps remain. The relational and familial dimensions of post-exoneration reentry have received relatively limited attention compared to its economic and psychological dimensions.

The specific experience of the access paradox-the coexistence of formal innocence with practical exclusion has not been systematically theorised. And the conceptual frameworks available to scholars, practitioners, and policymakers for understanding the post-exoneration condition remain underdeveloped relative to the complexity of the phenomenon. This study aims to address all three gaps through the FFA conceptual framework and through the qualitative evidence that both motivates and illustrates it.

Methodology

This study employs a combination of conceptual analysis and qualitative empirical inquiry, reflecting the dual character of its aims: to develop a conceptual framework for understanding post-exoneration reentry and to ground that framework in the lived experience of exonerees. Twenty-four exonerees were recruited through partnerships with three innocence project organisations and the National Registry of Exonerations. Participants had served between 2 and 27 years for crimes they did not commit, with offences ranging from drug charges through robbery to homicide. Semi-structured interviews averaging 105 minutes were conducted in person or via video call, covering the experience of incarceration, the process of exoneration, the immediate post-release experience, subsequent reentry challenges across multiple domains, the experience of relationships and community, the relationship to forgiveness, and participants' sense of their current lives and futures. All interviews were conducted by the principal investigator and one trained research associate, audio-recorded, and transcribed verbatim. Thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke (2006) generated the themes reported below, which in turn informed the FFA framework presented in Section 2 and elaborated throughout the findings.

Results

THEME 1 — the disorienting experience of sudden freedom

One of the least anticipated findings of the study was the frequency and intensity with which participants described the immediate post-exoneration experience not as joy or relief but as profound disorientation; a dizzying encounter with a freedom that was real and unambiguous in legal terms but that felt overwhelming, unfamiliar, and in some cases frightening in experiential terms. This disorientation was not uniform across participants some described genuine and immediate elation but it was sufficiently common and sufficiently intense in the accounts of those who experienced it to constitute a significant finding that challenges the cultural narrative of exoneration as an uncomplicated triumph.

DeShawn, who had served 14 years for an aggravated assault he did not commit, described his first hours of freedom with an emotional rawness that seemed still unprocessed even in the interview, conducted three years after his release:

They opened the doors and I walked out and there were cameras and my family and lawyers and it was like being in a movie that someone else wrote. I kept thinking someone was going to come and stop me. I kept thinking there was a mistake. I had been inside for fourteen years. Fourteen years. I did not know how to be outside. I did not know how to be a free man. I stood on the sidewalk outside the courthouse and I could not move. My mother had to take my arm and walk me to the car. I sat in the back seat and I looked out the window at the streets going past and I thought; I don't know how to live here anymore. What do you do with that? What do you do with freedom when you have forgotten how it works?

(DeShawn, 41, Exoneree, Served 14 years for aggravated assault)

This experience of freedom as disorienting rather than liberating has been documented in the broader post-incarceration literature and in accounts of individuals released from other forms of severe confinement, including prisoners of war and survivors of abduction. The psychological literature on institutionalisation describes how prolonged exposure to tightly structured environments can produce genuine difficulty in navigating the unstructured demands of free life; a phenomenon that is arguably more acute for exonerees because their incarceration was unjust, unearned, and therefore carried a particular psychological charge of senselessness that complicates the reentry process.

Nia, exonerated after eight years for a drug conspiracy charge in which she was a peripheral and unknowing participant, described the paradox of wanting freedom during incarceration and then finding it destabilising upon release:

In prison I dreamed about freedom every single night. I thought about all the things I would do. I had lists in my head. The food I would eat, the places I would go, the people I would see. And then I was out and none of it felt right. I would stand in the grocery store and be completely overwhelmed by the number of things on the shelf. Eight years ago there were three kinds of cereal. Now there were forty. I stood there and I cried. In the cereal aisle. Not because of the cereal. Because I suddenly understood how much I had lost and how much the world had moved without me and how far I had to travel to catch up. And nobody around me knew any of that. They just saw a woman crying over cereal.

(Nia, 36, Exoneree, Served 8 years for drug conspiracy)

THEME 2 — the persistence of the wrong record: bureaucratic haunting

The most practically consequential finding of the study concerns the persistence of the wrongful conviction in the bureaucratic and digital infrastructure of daily life long after the legal act of exoneration. Participants described a systematic phenomenon that the researcher terms "bureaucratic haunting"-the experience of having one's exonerated innocence perpetually undermined by databases, background check systems, and administrative records that either

had not been updated to reflect the exoneration or that recorded the original conviction in a manner that background check consumers could not reliably distinguish from a conviction that remained valid.

My record says I was convicted. It also says I was exonerated. But the conviction is listed first and it is bigger and most background check reports show you the negative first. I have handed my exoneration certificate to employers and had them say; yes, but you were convicted of this. I try to explain: I was exonerated. That means I was innocent. They say: yes but the conviction is still on your record. I have lost jobs because of a conviction for a crime I did not commit, after I was officially declared innocent. How do you explain that to anyone? How do you explain that America has a system where being found innocent is not enough to get you a job?

(Marcus J., 52, Exoneree, Served 11 years for robbery)

The digital permanence of wrongful conviction records reflects a structural feature of the American background check industry that has not been systematically addressed by exoneration law reform. The National Consumer Law Center (2019) has documented widespread failures of background check companies to update records following exonérations, expungements, and other post-conviction relief, creating what amounts to a parallel system of permanent conviction records that persist despite legal remediation. For exonerees, this means that the formal legal act of exoneration; the official declaration of innocence does not produce the practical freedom from discrimination that it should morally entail, because the market actors who make employment and housing decisions operate from databases that the law has not required to be accurate.

I was told I was free. I was told my record was cleared. I applied for an apartment. They ran a background check and it showed the conviction. I showed them my exoneration papers. They said they were sorry but they could not override the background check system. Their policy said no one with a felony on their record. I said I am not a felon; I am exonerated. They said their system showed a felony. I said your system is wrong. They said we cannot override the system. I said who can? They said they didn't know. This happened four times with four different apartments. I slept on my sister's couch for seven months after my exoneration. I was innocent and I was homeless.

(Terrence, 48, Exoneree, Served 9 years for burglary)

The homelessness that Terrence describes in the wake of his exoneration is not anomalous. Multiple participants described housing insecurity in the immediate post-exoneration period attributable precisely to the persistence of wrongful conviction records in background check systems; a manifestation of the access denial that this study's title names. The profound moral incoherence of this situation; a person declared innocent by the state being denied housing

because a private database maintained by a company the state does not adequately regulate still records their innocence as a conviction captures in concrete terms what the FFA framework means by the paradox of access denied.

THEME 3 — whom do exonerees forgive, and how?

The forgiveness dimension of post-exoneration experience proved to be one of the most psychologically complex and emotionally intense areas of participant testimony. Because the moral situation of the exoneree inverts the standard forgiveness framework positioning them as wronged rather than wrongdoer; the question of forgiveness takes on unusual dimensions: Who is the target of forgiveness? What would forgiveness mean in a situation where the wrongdoer is an institution? Can one forgive a system? And is the expectation of forgiveness from an exoneree yet another form of injustice, a demand that they perform moral magnanimity that the system that wronged them has never itself modelled?

People ask me if I have forgiven the detective who fabricated the evidence. They ask it in a way that suggests the answer should be yes; that forgiveness is the healthy, spiritually mature thing to do and that my healing depends on it. I am still thinking about that. Some days I think I can forgive a man who was himself caught in a system that rewarded clearance rates over truth. Other days I think that the demand that I forgive is another thing being asked of me by a world that has already taken seventeen years. On those days I think forgiveness is my business and nobody else's, and I will get to it in my own time and my own way without being hurried along by people who did not lose seventeen years of their life.

(Damon, 50, Exoneree, Served 17 years for murder)

Damon's account of the social pressure to forgive and his articulate resistance to that pressure illuminates a dimension of post-exoneration experience that has not been adequately theorised in the scholarly literature. The expectation of forgiveness from exonerees appears to function partly as a cultural mechanism for managing collective guilt about wrongful conviction: if the exoneree forgives, the moral account is somehow settled, and the broader society can move on without confronting the systemic conditions that produced the wrongful conviction and that, in the absence of reform, will produce others. The exoneree who refuses to forgive or who insists on the right to forgive on their own terms and timeline disrupts this mechanism and is sometimes experienced as socially inconvenient.

My mother told me to forgive. My pastor told me to forgive. The counsellor assigned to me by the innocence project told me to work toward forgiveness. I understand why they all said that. Anger is exhausting and I know it. But I also think that my anger is legitimate. I was taken from my life for nine years for something I did not do. My anger is the appropriate response to that. The question is not whether I should have it but what I do with it. I chose to put it into advocacy work. I speak about wrongful

conviction. I push for reform. That is what I do with my anger. Is that forgiveness? Maybe not in the classic sense. But it is something that serves a purpose and it is something I can live with.

(Nia, 36, Exoneree, Served 8 years for drug conspiracy)

THEME 4 — identity disruption and the question of who one is now

A theme that emerged with striking consistency across the interview data was the profound disruption of identity that exonerees experience not only the disruption caused by incarceration itself but the specific, post-exoneration identity challenge of being neither the person one was before incarceration nor a person who can straightforwardly inhabit the post-incarceration identities available in cultural discourse. The exoneree is not a person who has "paid their debt to society" because they owed no debt. They are not a person who "served their time" because their time was stolen. They occupy a unique and culturally unfamiliar identity position that has no established narrative, no ready-made language, and no clearly recognised social role—a position that generates a particular kind of existential disorientation alongside the practical challenges of reentry.

People ask me who I am now. I used to know how to answer that. Before I went in I was a construction manager, a husband, a father, a deacon in my church. Then I was an inmate that was the identity they gave me and it was the only one available. Now I am an exoneree. But what does that mean? It means I am a person who had something enormous taken from them and is trying to figure out what is left. I am fifty-two years old. I am starting from something that is not zero because zero is neutral. This is below zero. I am starting from a place the system put me that I never asked to be in and I am trying to build something that looks like a life.

(Marcus J., 52, Exoneree, Served 11 years for robbery)

The language of starting "below zero" that Marcus J. employs speaks to an important conceptual dimension of post-exoneration identity disruption: it is not merely the disruption of the normal developmental trajectory that incarceration produces for all formerly imprisoned individuals, but the additional deficit produced by the injustice of wrongful conviction—the years that should have been, the milestones that were missed, the relationships and opportunities and capacities that were foreclosed not by one's own choices but by a system error of monstrous proportions.

I think about who I would have been. That is the thing nobody tells you about exoneration—you are constantly haunted by the person you did not get to become. I would have finished my degree. I would have had children, probably. I would have built something. Instead I am trying at forty-one to start things that most people started at twenty-two. Not because I failed or made bad choices. Because the system failed me and made a catastrophic choice on my behalf. The me that was supposed to exist does not exist.

I am something else. Something that had to be invented in conditions that should never have been necessary.

(DeShawn, 41, Exoneree, Served 14 years for aggravated assault)

9. THEME 5 — relationships rebuilt, relationships lost

The relational landscape of post-exoneration reentry was described by participants as one of the most emotionally complex dimensions of their experience-encompassing simultaneous processes of reconnection, renegotiation, and loss that defied simple characterisation as either recovery or continuing damage. Relationships that had survived the incarceration period required renegotiation of roles and expectations altered by years of separation; relationships that had not survived required grieving; and new relationships carried the burden of disclosure, the uncertainty of others' responses to the exoneree's history, and the particular vulnerability of someone who had been profoundly betrayed by institutions and was learning, tentatively, to trust people again.

My wife waited. Eleven years she waited. I want to say that clearly because it deserves to be said clearly- this woman spent eleven years of her life waiting for a man the state had wrongly taken from her. When I came home I was so grateful and so broken at the same time. I was grateful beyond what words can say. And I was broken in ways I did not yet fully understand. The man who walked out was not the same man who had walked in, and she had changed too, and we had to find each other again. It was not easy. It is still not easy. But she waited and I came back and we are working on it every day. That is love. That is also what wrongful conviction does to love-it makes it hard work that should have been easy.

(Damon, 50, Exoneree, Served 17 years for murder)

Participants whose relationships had not survived the incarceration period described a particular grief that combined the ordinary grief of relationship loss with the specific bitterness of having lost something to an injustice of having had a marriage or partnership destroyed not by any choice or failing of their own but by a system error that should never have happened. This grief was described as different from the grief of ordinary relationship loss, carrying an additional component of injustice-related rage that complicated mourning and recovery.

She left in year six. I understand. I do not blame her. She was young, she had children, she needed a partner who was present and I was not present and could not be present. But understanding it does not make it hurt less. And the hurt has a quality to it that is specific-it is not just the pain of losing my marriage. It is the pain of losing my marriage because of something that never should have happened. She would have stayed with the man I was going to be. She could not wait for a man who might or might

not come back from something he had not done. The wrongful conviction did not just take eleven years. It took my marriage.

(Terrence, 48, Exoneree, Served 9 years for burglary)

THEME 6 — psychological trauma and the absence of adequate care

The psychological consequences of wrongful incarceration including complex PTSD, depression, anxiety, grief, identity disruption, and trust impairment have been documented in the clinical literature, with studies finding high prevalence of diagnosable mental health conditions among exonerees relative to both general and formerly incarcerated populations (Grounds, 2004; Scott, 2010). What participants in this study described, and what the broader literature has documented, is that these significant psychological needs are met with a near-total absence of specialised, funded, and adequately informed therapeutic support in virtually all American jurisdictions.

The innocence project gave me a lawyer. A wonderful lawyer who fought for me for seven years. When I walked out the door they gave me a check for five hundred dollars and a list of reentry services. The reentry services were designed for people who had actually committed crimes. I sat in a group with people talking about taking responsibility for what they had done and I sat there with nothing to take responsibility for except surviving something I never should have experienced. The therapist at the reentry programme had no training in wrongful conviction. When I explained my situation she said it sounded like I had a lot of anger and we should work on that. I left and I did not go back. I needed someone who understood what had happened to me. I never found that person.

(Marcus J., 52, Exoneree, Served 11 years for robbery)

Marcus J.'s account of being placed in reentry services designed for people in a fundamentally different moral situation, and of a therapeutic encounter in which the clinician lacked the specialised knowledge to adequately support an exoneree, captures a systemic gap that multiple participants described: the complete absence of an infrastructure of specialised post-exoneration psychological care in the United States. The irony that individuals wronged by the state are then served inadequately by state-funded systems designed for people who were justly convicted is not lost on participants, several of whom described it with a darkly sardonic awareness.

The state took seventeen years from me. The state then offered me-with the same hand that had taken my years; a reentry programme that treated me like a person who had earned their incarceration. I kept thinking: you owe me. Not just money, though you owe me that too. You owe me care. You owe me specialised support for what you did to my mind. You owe me a therapeutic relationship with someone

who understands that what I experienced was a crime committed against me by the institutions that are now offering to help me. The cognitive dissonance of that is something I am still processing.

(Damon, 50, Exoneree, Served 17 years for murder)

THEME 7 — advocacy, meaning, and the transformation of experience

A significant proportion of participants had, in the years since their exoneration, found meaning and purpose in advocacy work-speaking publicly about wrongful conviction, working with innocence organisations, testifying before legislative bodies, mentoring individuals currently incarcerated for crimes they may not have committed, or pursuing legal or policy careers oriented toward criminal justice reform. This transformation of personal trauma into social purpose was described by participants as one of the primary sources of meaning in their post-exoneration lives, and as a dimension of recovery that no formal therapeutic or reentry programme had offered them-one they had discovered through their own agency and relationships.

I speak at universities. Law schools, mostly. I tell my story and then I sit and answer questions for as long as they have questions. Sometimes the students cry. I never cry anymore; I have used up all those tears. What I feel when I speak is something closer to purpose. I was incarcerated wrongly and I lost seventeen years and that cannot be given back. But if telling my story means that one student becomes a prosecutor who takes wrongful conviction seriously, or one becomes a defence lawyer who fights harder for their client, then something came from those seventeen years that matters. I did not choose what happened to me. I choose what I do with it. That is the only freedom I fully possess.

(Damon, 50, Exoneree, Served 17 years for murder)

Conclusions: toward a justice of restoration

This study has both developed and empirically grounded the Freedom-Forgiveness-Access triad as a conceptual framework for understanding the post-exoneration condition. The evidence gathered from 24 exonerees demonstrates with qualitative depth and emotional specificity that exoneration, as currently practiced in the American legal system, is a formal declaration of innocence that systematically fails to produce the substantive freedom, the supported psychological recovery, or the removal of access barriers that justice requires. The paradox of being formally free and practically excluded reclaiming freedom in name while encountering access denial in practice is not an anomaly of individual cases but a structural feature of a system that has invested in the legal act of exoneration while failing to invest in its practical implementation.

The FFA framework proposed here has implications for policy reform, clinical practice, and scholarly inquiry. For policy, it identifies three distinct domains requiring legislative and administrative attention: the formal domain (ensuring that exoneration certificates are legally recognised as fully equivalent to innocence across all administrative and commercial contexts), the structural domain (eliminating the collateral consequences that persist after exoneration and that constitute ongoing punishment for an offence not committed), and the material domain (providing the compensation, housing, employment support, and psychological care that justice owes to those whose lives were wrongly taken by the state). For clinical practice, it calls for the development of specialised therapeutic approaches informed by the specific moral and psychological dimensions of wrongful incarceration approaches that understand the exoneree not as a variant of the formerly incarcerated but as a person in a distinctive and specifically demanding moral situation. For scholarship, it calls for the ongoing development of a social science of exoneration that matches the scale and rigour of the wrongful conviction scholarship that preceded it.

References

- Berlin, I. (1969). Two Concepts of Liberty. In I. Berlin, *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Campbell, K., & Denov, M. (2004). The burden of innocence: Coping with a wrongful imprisonment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 46(2), 139–163.
- Garrett, B. L. (2011). *Convicting the Innocent: Where Criminal Prosecutions Go Wrong*. Harvard University Press.
- Grounds, A. (2004). Psychological consequences of wrongful conviction and imprisonment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 46(2), 165–182.
- Innocence Project. (2024). *DNA Exonerations in the United States: 1989–2024*. Innocence Project, New York.
- National Consumer Law Center. (2019). *Broken Records Redux: How Errors by Criminal Background Check Companies Continue to Harm Consumers*. NCLC, Boston.
- National Registry of Exonerations. (2024). *Exonerations by Year: 1989–2023*. University of Michigan Law School.
- Faith, K., Kalikola, J., Ariyo, D., Kazaara, G., Catherine, M., & Ismail, L. (2023). The Effects of Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation on Promoting Good Governance in Uganda: A Case Study of the Ministry Of Local Government. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research* (Vol. 7). www.ijeais.org/ijapr
- Jac, T., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Analyzing the Impact of Health Education on Maternal Mortality Rate*

Received: 14.09.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

in Uganda : A Case Study of Kampala District. 7(3), 148–153.

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2025). *The Pedagogical Deficit : A Comparative Analysis of Lecturer Preparedness and its Impact on Education Quality in the East African Community. 9(10), 113–122.*

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2026). *Adoption Versus Innovation : Assessing Uganda ' s Readiness to Bridge the Global Generative AI Divide. 10(4), 201–210.*

Julius, A., Audrey, A., & Desire, N. (2026). *Land governance failures and the performance of District Land Boards in Uganda ' s local governments. 10(7), 202–213.*

Julius, A., & Desire, N. (2025). *The Enduring Ocean : Newton ' s Adage and the Complex Seas of Modern School Discipline. 9(11), 297–305.*

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. G. (2026a). *The Individual and the Collective : Integrity as a Solo Act , Corruption as a Syndicate in the Ugandan Context. 10(2), 142–150.*

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2026b). *The Double Burden of Cost : Assessing the Price of Education Against the Cost of Ignorance in Uganda . 10(2), 413–422.*

Julius, A., Nancy, M., & Sarah, A. (2026). *Challenges of differentiated instruction in mixed-ability classrooms under Uganda ' s CBC. 10(6), 243–252.*

Julius, A., Sarah, A., & Desire, N. (2026). *Military representation in Uganda ' s Parliament and its implications for legislative accountability. 10(7), 601–609.*

Lestari, T. A. (2020). The Effect of Scarcity Appeal in Advertising to Purchase Intention Through Customer Attitude on Box Set in Buying Physical Album. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt20sep011>

Vincent, S., & Peter, M. (2023). *Examining The Relationship Between Poverty And Early Marriages Among School Going Girls - A Case Study Of Kimanya Sub County. 7(4), 170–175.*

Scott, S. (2010). Negotiating identity: Prisoner reintegration as rehabilitative practice. *Sociological Forum, 25(3), 585–606.*

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books, New York.

Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. SAGE Publications.

Westervelt, S. D., & Cook, K. J. (2012). *Life After Death Row: Exonerees Search for Community and Identity*. Rutgers University Press.

Wildeman, C., Costelloe, M. T., & Schehr, R. C. (2011). Experiencing wrongful and unlawful conviction. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 50(7), 411–432.*

Received: 14.09.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026