

SACRAMENTS AND THE DIGITAL AGE: WHY PHYSICAL PRESENCE IS THEOLOGICALLY INDISPENSABLE

OVIE, Valentine Aghoghophia

Abstract

The rapid expansion of digital technology, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has raised unprecedented questions about sacramental validity: Can absolution be given over the phone? Can the Anointing of the Sick occur through a screen? Does livestreamed Mass constitute participation? This paper argues that such practices are invalid because they rupture the sacramental principles of ex opere operato, ex opere operantis, and instrumental causality. Drawing on patristic sources (Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose), scholastic theology (especially Aquinas), and Aristotelian philosophy, the study demonstrates that the sacraments are irreducibly embodied realities. The minister, as Christ's living instrument, must be physically proximate to the sacramental matter; remote actions fail to complete the sign instituted by Christ. While livestreamed or virtual practices may foster devotion (ex opere operantis), they cannot confer sacramental grace. In an era tempted to virtualize everything, the sacraments stand as a radical reminder of the Incarnation: grace comes through tangible, embodied encounters.

Keywords: Sacramental Theology, Ex Opere Operato, Ex Opere Operantis, Ministerial Proximity, Digital Mediation of Sacraments, Remote Participation

Introduction

The sacramental economy, the means by which Christ communicates the grace of his Paschal Mystery through tangible signs, constitutes the very lifeblood of the Catholic Church. For centuries, the principles governing their celebration—the union of specific matter and form, the intention of the minister, and the requisite disposition of the recipient—have provided a stable theological framework. However, the advent of the digital age, accelerated by global circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic, has precipitated a profound pastoral and theological crisis. This crisis challenges the foundational understanding of the sacraments as *embodied, communal, and ecclesial* acts situated in a specific spatio-temporal reality. A novel and problematic phenomenon has emerged: the attempt to administer and receive the sacraments through technological mediation.

On the part of the minister, well-intentioned but theologically erroneous practices are increasingly observed. Some priests, seeking to provide pastoral care, explore administering the Sacrament of Penance distanced from the penitent via telephone or video link, fracturing the integral connection between the minister, the penitent, and the spoken word of absolution. Others, in a misguided effort to minister to the sick, have been recorded anointing the camera lens or screen of a electronic device,

mistakenly believing the remote application of oil transmits the Sacrament of the Anointing of the Sick. Similarly, the sacred exchange of marital consent and the conferral of the nuptial blessing in the Sacrament of Matrimony have been proposed, and in some cases performed, through online platforms, treating a covenant that incarnationally signifies the union of Christ and his Church as a virtual event.

Concurrently, among the lay faithful, a correlative confusion has taken root. A growing number of the faithful demand access to the Sacrament of Reconciliation through digital means, perceiving it as a private transaction of grace rather than an ecclesial act of reconciliation. More pervasively, a widespread assumption holds that live-streamed or televised Eucharistic celebrations are spiritually equivalent to physical participation in the sacrifice of the Mass. This conflation, while often born of a sincere desire for connection, risks reducing the Holy Sacrifice—a true participation in the one sacrifice of Christ offered *hic et nunc* by a gathered priesthood—to a devotional viewing experience, a form of religious entertainment.

Proponents of digital sacramental practices might argue from a theology of "spiritual presence" or "virtual community," suggesting that the Holy Spirit can transcend physical limitations to unite the faithful. They might posit that intention and spiritual desire are the primary factors God honors, and that technology can serve as a new kind of sacramental "medium" for grace. While this view is often born of a sincere pastoral desire for inclusivity and access, this paper will contend that it rests on a flawed understanding of sacramental causality. It conflates God's omnipotence with His ordained means of grace, and it risks a form of spiritualism that neglects the incarnational principle—that God has chosen to save us not despite our physicality, but through it.

This paper argues that these practices and assumptions are not merely liturgically irregular but strike at the very heart of sacramental validity and efficacy. They represent a fundamental misunderstanding of the principles of *ex opere operato* (by the work worked) and *ex opere operantis* (from the work of the worker), and a flawed anthropology that neglects the minister's role as an instrumental cause. Through a rigorous theological analysis, this study will demonstrate that for a sacrament to be celebrated validly, the minister must be physically proximate to the matter, as the instrumentality of the minister requires a real, physical application to the sacramental sign. Furthermore, it will contend that remote participation, while potentially a source of devotional inspiration and actual grace, cannot constitute reception of the sacramental grace proper to the sacrament itself, which is intrinsically ordered towards a physically present participant within the assembled Body of Christ. By returning to these foundational principles, this paper

seeks to provide a clear explanation for why such digital innovations are not proper to the sacraments and to reaffirm the irreplaceable necessity of physical presence and tangible signs in the divine economy of salvation.

The Principle of *Ex Opere Operato*: Objective Efficacy and the Integrity of the Sacramental Sign

Before we can address the problem of remote sacraments, it is essential to recall the principle of *ex opere operato*. This principle explains why the sacraments work by the power of Christ Himself and not by the personal holiness of the minister. By grounding sacramental efficacy in the rite itself, *ex opere operato* shows why physical and embodied action is indispensable: the sign must be objectively completed in order to confer grace. The principle of *ex opere operato* is the theological linchpin of this entire inquiry. A precise understanding of this doctrine – that the sacraments confer grace by the power of Christ Himself and the completed rite – is not a tangential historical issue but the essential key for evaluating the problems of ministerial proximity and remote participation. It establishes the non-negotiable criteria for a valid sacramental sign: that it must be an objective, embodied action performed by a minister physically applied to the matter. Without this foundation, any argument against digital innovations remains merely disciplinary; with it, the case becomes a matter of theological necessity, demonstrating that such practices fundamentally rupture the causal chain through which divine grace is communicated.

The theological concepts of *ex opere operato* (from the work performed) and *ex opere operantis* (from the work of the worker) are scholastic terms that crystallize a crucial debate in sacramental theology: does the efficacy of a sacrament depend on the objective power of the rite itself, instituted by Christ, or on the subjective holiness of the minister or recipient? While these specific Latin phrases are post-patristic, the underlying theological reality was rigorously explored and defined by the Church Fathers, particularly in response to doctrinal crises. Through a systematic examination of their works, it becomes evident that the patristic consensus firmly established the principle that the sacraments derive their efficacy primarily from Christ's authority and promise, not human merit, thereby laying the indispensable groundwork for the later formal doctrine of *ex opere operato*.

The earliest significant contributions to this discourse emerged from the North African church in the context of the Donatist controversy. The Donatists argued that sacraments administered by priests who had lapsed during persecution were invalid, effectively making the sanctity of the minister (*ex opere operantis*) a prerequisite for the validity of the sacrament.

Saint Cyprian of Carthage, writing in the 3rd century, initially held a position that emphasized the need for the minister to be within the unity of the Church. For Cyprian, the validity of a sacrament was inextricably linked to the lawful authority and orthodox standing of the minister. He argued that heretics and schismatics, being outside the Church, could not possess the Holy Spirit and therefore could not validly confer Him. As he stated, "Can the power of baptism be greater or of more avail than confession, than suffering? . . . that none can be baptized abroad outside the Church, since there is one baptism appointed in the holy Church" (Cyprian, Epistle 69). Cyprian's focus was on the objective requirement of the minister being in communion with the true Church, a necessary step toward, but not identical to, the full *ex opere operato* concept.

It was Saint Augustine of Hippo, responding to the same Donatist schism a century later, who provided the most comprehensive and definitive patristic refutation of the *ex opere operantis* view and the most robust defense of what would become known as *ex opere operato*. Augustine systematically dismantled the Donatist position by divorcing the objective efficacy of the sacrament from the subjective morality of its minister. He developed the principle that Christ is the ultimate interior minister of every sacrament, and the human cleric is merely an instrumental cause. In his seminal work, *On Baptism, Against the Donatists*, Augustine employs a powerful analogy to illustrate this: "For the spiritual virtue of the sacrament is like light: those to be enlightened are presented to it, and it benefits them even if it passes through unclean beings. It is itself pure and applies no stain from the unclean things it passes through" (Augustine, *On Baptism* 5.20). This metaphor clearly establishes the sacrament as an objective vehicle of grace whose power is inherent and divine, not dependent on the purity of its human administrator.

Augustine further solidified this principle by distinguishing between the sacrament itself (*sacramentum*) and its efficacy or fruit (*virtus sacramenti*). He conceded that an unworthy minister could validly confer the *sacramentum*, but that its grace would not be fruitful for the minister himself or for an unworthy recipient until they were reconciled with the Church. This distinction allowed him to affirm both the objective validity of the rite and the necessity of proper disposition for its salvific effects. He famously argued that even a sacrament administered by a known schismatic, like the Donatist leader Petilianus, was still valid because its power came from Christ: "For the sacrament of baptism is what the person possesses who is baptized; and the sacrament of conferring baptism is what the person possesses who is ordained. And as the baptized person, if he departs from the unity of the Church, does not thereby lose the sacrament of baptism, so also the minister, if he departs from the unity of the Church, does not lose the

sacrament of conferring baptism" (Augustine, *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* 2.13.28). For Augustine, the "work worked" is Christ's work, not man's.

Building upon this Western tradition, the Greek Fathers also articulated the objective nature of sacramental efficacy, particularly in the Eucharist. Saint John Chrysostom, in his work *On the Priesthood*, emphasized the awe-inspiring truth that the power of the sacramental transformation resides not in the person of the priest but in the words of Christ and the invocation of the Holy Spirit. He compellingly argues for the *ex opere operato* principle by highlighting the unworthiness of even the Apostles who first celebrated the Eucharist: "For it is not man who causes the things offered to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The priest stands there carrying out the action and speaking those words, but the power and the grace are from God. 'This is My Body,' he says. These words transform the elements offered" (Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood* 6.4). Chrysostom's point is unequivocal: the transformative power is located in the divine imperative of Christ's institution, making the sacrament effective by its own operation, not by the priest's personal sanctity.

Similarly, Saint Ambrose of Milan, in his catechetical instructions to the newly baptized, grounded the certainty of sacramental grace in the faithfulness of Christ's word rather than human virtue. In *De Mysteriis (On the Mysteries)*, he confronts the doubt of those who might question how earthly elements can confer heavenly grace. His answer bypasses the minister entirely and points to the precedent of God's power in Scripture and the authority of Christ's utterance. "But if the word of Elijah had power to call down fire from heaven, will not the word of Christ have power to change the specific character of the elements? ... You have read that in the Gospel: 'This is My Body... This is My Blood.' You have read the words; consider now the power of the word" (Ambrose, *De Mysteriis* 9.52-53). For Ambrose, the "word" is the operative force, the divine imperative that performs the "work," ensuring that the sacrament is a reliable channel of grace irrespective of human failing. Yet while *ex opere operato* guarantees the objective efficacy of the sacrament itself, it raises another question: what role does the personal faith and disposition of the minister or recipient play in the fruitfulness of that grace? This leads us to the principle of *ex opere operantis*.

The Principle of *Ex Opere Operantis*: The Distinction Between Personal Piety and Sacramental Efficacy

If *ex opere operato* safeguards the objectivity of sacramental grace, *ex opere operantis* highlights the role of personal disposition in receiving that grace fruitfully. This

distinction is crucial for our question because it shows why remote participation, while it may foster devotion (*ex opere operantis*), can never replace true sacramental reception, which operates *ex opere operato* through embodied presence. The doctrine of *ex opere operato* (from the work performed) guarantees the objective efficacy of the sacraments, assuring the faithful that grace is conferred by the power of Christ's institution, regardless of the minister's personal holiness. However, this raises a critical question: what is the role of the human person's disposition? This is where the principle of *ex opere operantis* (from the work of the worker) enters Catholic theology. It is crucial to understand that *ex opere operantis* does not refer to the validity or inherent power of the sacrament itself, but to the subjective devotion, faith, and piety of the individual—either the minister or the recipient—which can influence the *fruitfulness* of the grace received. The Church Fathers and Scholastics systematically distinguished this principle from *ex opere operato* to create a complete sacramental theology that honors both divine guarantee and human cooperation.

The foundational work for this distinction was laid by the Church Fathers, particularly in their battles against Donatism and Pelagianism. While their primary aim was to defend the objective power of the sacraments (*ex opere operato*), they necessarily had to account for the evident fact that not all recipients derived the same spiritual benefit from them. Saint Augustine of Hippo provides the most nuanced patristic treatment. He firmly established that the sacrament's validity is objective, but its fruitful reception requires a subjective disposition of charity (*caritas*). In his anti-Donatist works, he makes a seminal distinction between the *sacramentum* itself (the outward sign) and the *res sacramenti* (the grace or reality of the sacrament). He argues that the unworthy recipient receives the *sacramentum* validly but not the *res*, to his own judgment: "For it is one thing to be baptized, another to be justified... Judas was baptized, and yet was not justified; Simon was baptized, and yet was not justified" (Augustine, *On Baptism, Against the Donatists* 5.21.29). Here, Augustine establishes that the objective work (*opus operatum*) is distinct from the personal work or disposition of the recipient (*opus operantis*). The baptism was real and valid for Judas, but his lack of charity (*caritas*) prevented it from bearing fruit.

This Augustinian distinction became the bedrock of all subsequent discussion. The Greek Fathers, such as Saint John Chrysostom, also emphasized the necessity of personal disposition for receiving grace fruitfully, though their focus was often more pastoral than polemical. Chrysostom, in his homilies, constantly exhorted his congregation to approach the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, with proper reverence and a pure heart. His teachings highlight the *ex opere operantis* principle by warning that a lack of devotion can render the reception of the sacrament spiritually harmful rather than salvific. "Would you like to know how the holy

Eucharist is a grace? Approach with a pure conscience, with a heart void of wickedness... For if we approach with piety, we leave there like lions breathing fire, terrible to the devil" (Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 24.4). For Chrysostom, the objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood is guaranteed (*ex opere operato*), but the subjective experience of its power—whether it becomes a blessing or a condemnation—depends entirely on the piety and preparation of the communicant (*ex opere operantis*).

The Scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages, building directly on this patristic foundation, systematized these concepts using precise philosophical language. Their great contribution was to name and define the terms *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* and to carefully delineate their respective spheres. St. Thomas Aquinas is the paramount figure in this effort. He explains that the sacrament's power to confer grace comes from God alone, not from the human minister or recipient. However, he affirms that a person can, through their own acts of devotion, become better disposed to receive a greater outpouring of sacramental grace. This is the essence of *ex opere operantis*: it is a merit arising from the person's own pious action, which is *added* to the grace of the sacrament itself.

Aquinas makes a critical clarification: the devotion of the minister does not affect the *validity* or *basic efficacy* of the sacrament (*ex opere operato*), but it can affect the degree of grace *if the recipient is properly disposed*. He writes, "The devotion of the minister is not the cause of the sacrament's efficacy... Nevertheless, the minister can, by his devotion, merit for himself a greater grace from the sacrament... and he can also, by his prayer and devotion, beseech a greater effect for the recipient, *if the recipient is disposed*" (Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Sentences*, IV, d. 1, q. 1, a. 5, sol. 2, ad 4). This is a sophisticated balance: the sacrament works objectively, but the personal piety of both minister and recipient (*ex opere operantis*) can influence the subjective intensity and fruitfulness of the grace received.

Furthermore, the Scholastics, including St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, applied this principle beyond the seven sacraments to explain the efficacy of sacramentals and pious acts. They taught that actions like blessings, prayers, or pilgrimages have no inherent, guaranteed power from Christ's institution. Their efficacy derives *ex opere operantis ecclesiae* (from the work of the Church working)—meaning from the Church's general prayer and authority—and even more so *ex opere operantis* (from the work of the individual worker), meaning from the faith and devotion of the person performing or receiving them (Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* 5.7; Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, d. 1, q. 1). This application starkly contrasts them with the sacraments, whose power is always and inherently *ex opere operato*. In conclusion, the theological journey from the Church Fathers to the

Scholastics reveals a consistent and careful effort to distinguish two complementary principles.

The Fathers, led by Augustine, fought to secure the objective foundation: the sacrament is effective by God's power, not man's (*ex opere operato*) (Augustine, On Baptism 5.20). Yet, they honestly acknowledged that its fruit requires a heart open to grace (*ex opere operantis*) (Augustine, Homilies on the First Epistle of John 5.1). The Scholastics, with Aquinas at the forefront, then provided the precise philosophical vocabulary to articulate this distinction. They clarified that *ex opere operantis* pertains wholly to the realm of subjective personal piety, devotion, and disposition (Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 64, a. 1, ad 1). It is the variable that explains why the same objective sacrament can be a source of life for one person and condemnation for another (Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 79, a. 3, ad 2). This distinction preserves the incredible gift of the sacraments as certain channels of God's grace while simultaneously upholding the Christian call to active, devout, and fruitful participation in the divine life. The distinction between objective efficacy and subjective disposition makes clear why remote participation cannot be equated with sacramental reception. To understand more deeply why physical presence is indispensable, we must now turn to the philosophy of instrumentality, which explains the minister's role as Christ's living instrument in applying grace to matter.

The Aristotelian Principles of an Instrument: A Theoretical Framework

To understand why the minister must be physically present to the sacramental matter, we must also consider the principle of instrumentality. The priest is Christ's living instrument in the sacraments, and just as an instrument must be physically applied to the material it acts upon, so too must the minister be in real contact with the matter of the sacrament. Without this physical proximity, the sacramental action cannot take place. A fundamental concept within Aristotelian philosophy is the nature of an instrument (*organon*). Aristotle's principles on this subject are not explicitly enumerated but are instead woven into his broader theories of causality, potentiality, and actuality, primarily within his works *Physics* and *De Anima* (*On the Soul*). The following principles form a coherent framework for understanding what constitutes an instrument and its role in the natural and artificial worlds.

The primary Aristotelian principle governing an instrument is that it is defined not by its material composition but by its function and purpose, or its final cause (*telos*). As Aristotle establishes in his psychological treatise, an entity is truly itself only when it can perform its essential activity. He illustrates this by stating that a non-functioning eye is an eye in name only, as its being is contingent upon its

capacity to see (Aristotle, *On the Soul* 412b21-22). This functionalist criterion applies equally to artificial tools; a saw's essence is derived from its power to cut, not from the iron from which it is forged. Consequently, the identity and very being of an instrument are inextricably linked to the end it is designed to serve. Furthermore, an instrument is characterized by its inherent subordinate status as a means to an end, never an end in itself. Within Aristotle's causal schema, instruments are classified as things that exist for the sake of something else, distinguishing them from ultimate goods or final ends (Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 1218b12-13). This relationship creates a hierarchy of use; for instance, a loom is an instrument for the art of weaving, which is itself an instrument for the production of clothing, which serves the higher end of protection (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1094a10-11). The instrument's value and *raison d'être* are therefore wholly derived from the higher-order activity or good it facilitates.

A critical operational principle is that an instrument, being inanimate or possessing a lower order of soul, cannot initiate motion autonomously and must be activated by a principal agent. The instrument acts as the instrumental cause, while the user who wields it is the efficient cause. This relationship is fundamental to Aristotle's definition of the soul-body relationship, wherein he posits the soul as the prime mover that employs the body as its instrument to achieve its ends, such as perception and locomotion (Aristotle, *On the Motion of Animals* 703a29-30). The tool, whether a rudder or a hand, remains passive potentiality until actualized by the will and action of the external agent.

In the act of being used, the instrument participates in the action of the principal agent while retaining its distinct ontological status. The action undertaken is properly attributed to the user, not the tool, though the tool is the necessary medium through which the action is effected. As the agent employs the instrument, the two form a causal unity for the duration of the activity, yet their natures remain separate; the carpenter does not become the hammer, nor the hammer the carpenter. This principle is implicit throughout Aristotle's discussion of efficient causality, where the mover and the moved are distinct yet cooperative in producing an effect (Aristotle, *Physics* 202a13-14). The most profound application of these principles is Aristotle's conceptualization of the living body as the instrument of the soul. He argues that the soul is the form and actuality of a natural body that has life potentially, and as such, the body serves as its organic instrument (*organon*) (Aristotle, *On the Soul* 412a28-29).

This relationship is inseparable; the faculties of the soul—nutrition, perception, thought—are actualized through the body. Consequently, the body is not merely a container for the soul but is the essential apparatus through which the soul

expresses its capacities and achieves its ends, completing the integration of instrumental theory into Aristotelian metaphysics and biology. Having established the minister's role as Christ's instrument, the practical consequence becomes unavoidable: an instrument must act in physical contact with the matter. This insight leads us directly to the necessity of ministerial proximity in the sacraments.

The Necessity of Ministerial Proximity to the Sacramental Matter

The validity of the sacraments is contingent upon the minister's physical proximity to the matter; a necessity derived from the very nature of *ex opere operato* efficacy and the theology of instrumental causality. Given that the efficacy of the sacraments operates *ex opere operato*—flowing from the objective power of the rite itself instituted by Christ—the requirement for the minister's physical proximity to the matter becomes a theological necessity, not a mere disciplinary rule. This necessity is derived from the theology of instrumental causality, where the priest acts as the instrument of Christ, the primary agent. Consequently, the parameters for the sacrament's administration are set by divine institution, not human convenience. To attempt to administer a sacrament with the minister distanced from the matter is, theologically, an attempt to redefine a God-ordained means of grace, thereby violating the principle of *ex opere operato* at its source and rendering the action invalid.

Secondly, the sacraments are not merely spiritual events; they are encounters with grace through tangible, sense-perceptible signs. The minister's role is not to be a passive observer but an active animated instrument who physically performs the rite. Aquinas's philosophy of instrumental causality is crucial here. For an instrument to act, it must be physically applied to the object. A painter must touch the brush to the canvas; a surgeon must wield the scalpel on the body. Analogously, the priest, as Christ's instrument, must be physically applied to the matter to act upon it. The physical actions—pouring water, anointing with oil, laying on hands—are not incidental ceremonies but constitute the very matter of the sacrament, which, when joined with the form (the words), complete the sacramental sign.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, echoing this ancient teaching, states that the sacraments "are perceived by the senses" and "effected by signs" which are "sensible and accessible to human nature" (CCC 1084, 1153). A minister anointing a camera lens or speaking words of absolution into a telephone handset is not performing the sensible sign instituted by Christ. He is performing a different, disembodied action. This breaks the objective uniformity of the sacramental sign, making it a

subjective and private gesture rather than the universal, ecclesial act of the Church, and thus cannot be efficacious *ex opere operato*.

Thirdly, the Aristotelian principle of functional definition reveals the minister's role as an instrument. Just as "a non-functioning eye is an eye in name only" (Aristotle, *On the Soul* 412b21-22), a priest distanced from the sacramental matter cannot perform the essential activity—the *telos*—for which he is ordained and configured. Anointing a screen or absolving a voice over a phone is not the function of the sacramental instrument; it is a different action entirely. Thus, the minister ceases to be a valid instrument *in actu* (in act), rendering the action invalid. Fourthly, the hierarchy of ends clarifies this invalidity. The minister is a subordinate instrument whose value is "wholly derived from the higher-order activity or good it facilitates" (Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 1218b12-13). This higher good is the grace of Christ communicated through an *embodied* sign. To attempt to facilitate this embodied good through a disembodied means (e.g., a virtual presence) is a categorical error. It inverts the proper hierarchy by subordinating the sacramental end to a non-physical mode of operation, severing the instrument from its purpose. Fifthly, the principle of activation confirms that distant mediation breaks the causal chain. An instrument "cannot initiate motion autonomously and must be activated by a principal agent" (Aristotle, *On the Motion of Animals* 703a29-30). For Christ to "wield" His human instrument, there must be a physical point of contact. The priest's physical actions are the medium through which Christ, the efficient cause, applies grace. A minister distant from the matter is an instrument in "passive potentiality," like a saw not touching wood, and is therefore never activated by the principal agent.

Sixthly, the minister and Christ form a causal unity in the physical action. In the sacramental act, the priest and Christ form a unified causal agent: "the two form a causal unity for the duration of the activity" (Aristotle, *Physics* 202a13-14). The action is properly attributed to Christ, but it is effected through the physical medium of the priest. This unity requires a physical, spatio-temporal conjunction. The action of consecrating, anointing, or absolving is one single, embodied event occurring in a specific place. If the minister is in one location and the matter in another, this causal unity is shattered. There are two separate actions: a person performing a gesture before a device, and a remote object being acted upon by technology. This is not the single, unified action of Christ through his minister but two disjointed events, preventing the sacrament from being a true *opus operatum* (a work worked).

Seventhly, the human body is the soul's instrument for engaging the material world. Aristotle's most profound insight—that "the living body [is] the instrument of the soul" (*On the Soul* 412a28-29)—seals the argument. The soul's faculties are

"actualized through the body." This mirrors the sacramental economy: Christ (the primary agent) uses His humanity as His instrument to communicate salvation. He in turn uses the minister's humanity—his body and soul—as a subordinate instrument. The minister's *body* is therefore not optional but essential. It is the "apparatus through which the soul expresses its capacities." For the minister to intend to confer a sacrament, that intention *must* be enacted through his physical body applied to the physical matter. A disembodied intention or a virtual action is not a full human act and therefore cannot be used by Christ as a valid instrument. The minister's physical body is ontologically necessary to complete the chain of instrumental causality from God to the material world, reaffirming the incarnational principle that grace is communicated through tangible, physical means.

The Inefficacy of Remote Participation: *Ex Opere Operato* vs. *Ex Opere Operantis* in Sacramental Reception

The grace of the sacraments is conferred according to the principle of *ex opere operato* (from the work worked), meaning the efficacy flows from the objective performance of the sacramental rite itself, instituted by Christ, rather than from the subjective holiness of the minister or recipient (*ex opere operantis*, from the work of the worker). This foundational distinction is the key to understanding why physical presence is an indispensable requirement for receiving sacramental grace and why watching a Mass on a screen, while potentially devotionally beneficial, constitutes an act of *ex opere operantis* that is not equivalent to sacramental participation.

Ex Opere Operato: the sacrament as an objective cause ordered to a present recipient: the Council of Trent defined the *ex opere operato* principle dogmatically to counter the Reformation claim that sacraments were merely signs of faith. It declared that the sacraments of the New Law "contain the grace which they signify, and confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in the way" (Council of Trent, Session 7, *Canons on the Sacraments in General*, Canon 6). This grace is conferred "by the power of the rite itself" (*ex vi rite acti*). However, this objective power is not an abstract force; it is intrinsically ordered toward and requires a proper subject for its reception. The sacraments are not magic. The *ex opere operato* guarantee means that the sacrament, when validly celebrated, *offers* grace objectively. Yet, for that grace to be received *sacramentally*, the recipient must be positioned to receive it according to the nature of the rite. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states, the sacraments "presuppose faith" and their fruitfulness "depends on the disposition of the one who receives them" (CCC 1122, 1131). This disposition includes being physically present to undertake the action proper to the sacrament. For the Eucharist, this is *receiving* Holy Communion. For Penance, it

is *confessing* and *receiving* absolution. For Anointing, it is *being anointed*. A televised viewer cannot perform these receptive acts. They are outside the spatial and causal field of the *opus operatum* – the work worked. The grace is offered in the church, but they are not there to receive it sacramentally.

Ex Opere Operantis: the subjective devotion of the remote viewer: In contrast to the objective power of the sacrament, the devotion of someone watching a mass on television operates purely on the principle of *ex opere operantis*. This refers to the spiritual benefit derived from the subjective faith, piety, and interior disposition of the person performing a good work or devotional act. Watching a mass broadcast can be a profound act of prayer, a desire for spiritual communion, and a source of actual grace (i.e., God's prompting and help to live a Christian life). The Church encourages this for those who are legitimately impeded from attending, such as the sick and homebound. However, it is crucial to recognize this for what it is: a *substitute*, not an equivalent. The *Code of Canon Law* recognizes this distinction, granting a dispensation from the obligation to attend Mass on Sundays and Holy Days for those with a "grave cause," such as illness (CIC 1245). The law implies that watching a broadcast does not fulfill the obligation because it is not participation in the sacrifice. The spiritual benefits derived are proportional to the viewer's faith and devotion (*ex opere operantis*), not from the objective accomplishment of the sacramental rite (*ex opere operato*).

The Ecclesial Act: physical presence within the assembled *Corpus Christi*: the mass is not a private devotional prayer but the action of Christ the Head united with His Body, the Church. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* teaches that in the liturgy, "Christ is present... in the person of His minister... but especially under the Eucharistic species" and also "He is present when the Church prays and sings" (SC 7). The faithful are not an audience but are called to "full, conscious, and active participation" (SC 14). This participation is inherently physical and communal: it involves responding, kneeling, standing, processing, and most importantly, receiving Communion. This gathering of the baptized is a constitutive part of the sacramental sign. St. Paul's theology of the Church as the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12-27) underscores that the members are organically, physically connected. A virtual presence is a metaphysical impossibility in this ecclesial context; one is either physically assembled or not. By watching a broadcast, a person is related to the liturgical action as a witness to a sign, not as a member engaged in the sign. They are related to the Eucharist as an object of devotion, not as a recipient of the sacrifice. Therefore, their participation, however devout, remains in the realm of *ex opere operantis* – a personal, subjective devotion sparked by what they see – rather than *ex opere operato* – an objective incorporation into the sacrificial act.

In summary, the distinction between *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* is not merely theological jargon but describes two fundamentally different modes of receiving grace. The sacraments operate *ex opere operato*, requiring physical presence to receive the objective grace that is caused and signified. Watching a televised mass operates *ex opere operantis*, depending on the subjective devotion of the individual. To conflate the two is to commit a categorical error that risks reducing the sacraments—efficacious signs of grace—to mere aids for personal piety. It obscures the truth that God’s grace in the New Covenant is communicated not as a private interior impulse, but through the tangible, physical, and ecclesial encounter with Christ in His sacraments.

Conclusion

The validity and fruitfulness of the sacraments rest on three inseparable principles: *ex opere operato*, which safeguards the objective efficacy of the rite; *ex opere operantis*, which acknowledges the necessity of proper personal disposition; and the principle of instrumentality, which grounds the minister’s role as Christ’s living agent of grace. Together, these demonstrate why the sacraments are irreducibly embodied realities: they require a minister physically present to the matter and a recipient truly engaged in the ecclesial act. Remote participation, though capable of fostering devotion, belongs to the realm of *ex opere operantis* and cannot substitute for sacramental reception itself. In an age tempted to virtualize everything, the sacraments stand as a radical reminder of the Incarnation: God’s grace comes to us not through disembodied signs, but through tangible, physical encounters with Christ in His Church.

Works Cited

Ambrose of Milan. *On the Mysteries (De Mysteriis)*. Translated by Tom Thompson and James H. Stubblebine. *St. Ambrose: Theological and Dogmatic Works*, Catholic University of America Press, 1963, pp. 9-10.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard (Scriptum super Sententiis)*, Book IV. Translated by Beth Mortensen, The Aquinas Institute, 2018.

---. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, New Advent, 1947, newadvent.org/summa/.

Aristotle. *Eudemian Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard UP, 1935.

---. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W. D. Ross, Random House, 1941.

---. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W. D. Ross, revised by J. O. Urmson. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol. 2, Princeton UP, 1984, pp. 1729-1867.

---. *On the Motion of Animals*. Translated by A. S. L. Farquharson. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol. 1, Princeton UP, 1984, pp. 1087-1096.

---. *On the Soul*. Translated by J. A. Smith. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol. 1, Princeton UP, 1984, pp. 641-692.

---. *Physics*. Translated by R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol. 1, Princeton UP, 1984, pp. 315-446.

Augustine of Hippo. *Against the Letter of Parmenianus (Contra epistulam Parmeniani)*. Translated by J. R. King. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 4, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf104.

---. *Homilies on the First Epistle of John*. Translated by H. Browne. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 7, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1888. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf107.

---. *On Baptism, Against the Donatists*. Translated by J. R. King. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 4, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf104.

Bonaventure. *Breviloquium*. Translated by Erwin Esser Nemmers, B. Herder Book Co., 1946.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. 2nd ed., Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997, vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/.

Chrysostom, John. *Homilies on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Translated by Talbot W. Chambers. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 12, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1889. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf112.

---. *On the Priesthood*. Translated by W. R. W. Stephens. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 9, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1889. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf109.

Cyprian of Carthage. *The Epistles of Cyprian*. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 5, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886. CCEL, ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf05.

Scotus, John Duns. *Ordinatio. Opera Omnia*, edited by Charles Balić et al., Civitas Vaticana, 1950.

**DIGITAL RESPONSIBILITY IN NIGERIA THROUGH KANTIAN ETHICS:
APPLYING IMMANUEL KANT'S CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE TO DATA
PRIVACY, SURVEILLANCE, AND ONLINE MISINFORMATION IN
NIGERIA'S DIGITAL ECONOMY**

Introduction: The Digital Transformation And Ethical Imperative

Nigeria is also experiencing a tremendous digital transformation and at the first two quarters of 2025, the digital economy would contribute N7.37 trillion (14.4) to the real GDP, and this is a remarkable 18.4 national growth compared to the previous year (Fagbemi, 2025). Such expansion comprises over 142 million active internet subscribers and social media users (36.75) that offered untapped growth and baffling ethical challenges (Freedom House, 2024). Since Nigeria is on the border of technology, government, and personal liberties, the need to have proper ethical frameworks so that one can guide the digital custodianship becomes all the more acute.

The scale of the digital transformation in Nigeria demands serious ethical dilemma. The traditional approaches in technology governance are more inclined to refer to technical solutions and to the stimuli related to economy and fail to mention the philosophical foundations of the relationship between man and technology. This rule is particularly problematic in new economies where the rapid process of digitalization does not regulate citizens and their rights are being violated and misused.

The deontological ethics or rather the categorical imperative as introduced by Immanuel Kant offers a reasonable framework of the analysis of digital practices. Kant main tenet, according to which an individual should never be viewed as a means to an end but as something that must be viewed as an end, makes it a simple moral standard to be applied when analyzing the data collection and surveillance systems and the integrity of information (Johnson & Cureton, 2022). Unlike the consequentialist methods which believe that the outcomes alone define the actions, the Kantian morals refer to the intentions and the principles of the technological practices and whether the digital practices place human dignity in perspective and can be generalized without contradiction.

The essay will dwell on three areas of Nigeria online space that are salient such as coverage of data privacy protection, surveillance and control of misinformation. The human autonomy and dignity is questioned in all these areas and must be evaluated in terms of morality. The research questions that will inform the research will take the following form: (1) How does the presence of practices in the Nigerian digital spaces adhere to the Kantian moral principle? (2) What are some of the systematic violations of human dignity due to the application of data and

surveillance? (3) How can the categorical imperative inform us regarding change of policy to save the digital rights and to permit technological progress?

The importance of this analysis is emphasized by recent events. Data protection-Nigeria Data Protection Commission (NDPC) has started conducting investigations of over 1,000 entities on compliance breach; a sign of heightened awareness regarding digital rights (Wolfenden, 2025). Simultaneously, the 2023 elections demonstrated that the misinformation campaigns can negatively affect the democratic process and the voter turnout dropped to 26.72 part of which can be attributed to the manipulation of the media (MDIF, 2024). These tendencies indicate that there is an immediate need in the introduction of ethical frameworks beyond regulatory compliance, which will give ethical grounds of digital citizenship.

Nigeria is provided with opportunities and responsibilities due to the fact that it is the largest digital economy in Africa. The nation can be in the lead in setting digital governance policies that will balance innovation and human dignity that will be applied in the other emerging markets. To realize this possibility though, one must transcend technocratic remedies to philosophically-grounded policies that are mindful of the direst consequences of technology on human autonomy, privacy, and democratic involvement.

Kantian Ethics and Digital Citizenship: Philosophical Foundations and Contemporary Applications

The Categorical Imperative in Digital Context

The categorical imperative created by Kant offers eternal moral guidance to the modern technological dilemma. The principle requires: "Do only that according to which you may at the same time will that this should become a universal law" (Kant, 1785/1993). In this formulation, the issue is that digital practices should be considered in terms of their universalizability, that is, whether they can be generalized to all the people and cause logical contradictions or the necessity to change the grounds of social cooperation.

This test of universalizability is especially applicable in the digital world. Take data collection practices into account: in case all entities were collecting and exploiting user information without any meaningful consent, there would be no trust, and it would be impossible to conduct digital commerce and communications. The act is therefore self-defeating when the first formulation of Kant is applied to them. Such rational argument has more rationale in ethical data practices than the appeal to consequences alone as it does recognize underlying moral contradictions in exploitative technologies.

The second formulation -humanity formulation- claims: act in such a manner that you do not treat humanity, whether in yourself or in the person of any other, but in yourself and in the person of any other, you treat humanity at once as an end to an end (Kant, 1785/1993, p. 36). This principle is in direct opposition to common models of digital business, which perceive users not as self-reliant agents deserving of respect, but rather as sources of information. In cases where interfaces are designed by the platforms in a way that they extract as much data as possible and reduce the amount of understanding needed by the user, the platforms are in breach of this core Kantian requirement.

In recent research, Kantian ethics are applied to artificial intelligence and digital technologies, and it is stressed that human moral agency requires moral behavior in the development, deployment, and regulation of technology (Ulgen, 2017). This point of view is particularly useful to assess the adequacy of regulatory systems in Nigeria and the regulatory mechanisms with regard to the protection of human dignity in cyberspace.

Digital Autonomy and Human Dignity

Kantian autonomy is extended further than self-determination and further to refer to principled autonomy of O'Neill (2002), which is the capacity to act on the grounds which can be intelligible to another in a rational dialogue. It aligns with transparency, informed consent and meaningful choice requirements in digital contexts as far as the collection and use of personal data is concerned. Users are expected to be in a position to understand words on which they engage digital services and judge them rationally.

Kant ethics are concerned with human dignity in which people possess intrinsic values that cannot be instrumentalized (O'Neill, 2002). This ideal serves as an objection to the present digital culture, in which user information, Web behavior is largely regarded as a valuable resource to be traded commercially, as opposed to a declaration of self-agency. Such fact that human experience could be transformed into data sets that could be worked with the help of algorithms raises serious doubts whether digital technologies could respect or violate the dignity that Kant describes as the main part of the moral philosophy.

The autonomous choice has particular problems with the digital environment in Nigeria. The digital divide with the 45.5% internet penetration rate creates a situation where internet access is already a prerequisite to the freedom of choice in an already digital society (Freedom House, 2024). The unconnected are systematically excluded in opportunities of independent involvement in the case of the migration of the basic services to the web. Moreover, the platforms that are accessible also confront those that are meant to exploit cognitive biases as well as

seek to manipulate their actions rather than make rational decisions as required by Kantian autonomy.

Dignity is also a concept that mandates that the digital systems must be designed to progress rather than diminish the human abilities. When algorithms provide consequential determinations of persons, e.g. as over creditworthy or not employed or on social services, without giving the notion of how it was determined or with any meaningful appeal, it does not treat persons as beings capable of understanding and challenging decision-making that affects their lives but as objects to be processed by an algorithm instead. Even the most accurate and efficient of these systems fail to pass the most basic Kantian standards.

Kantian Evaluation of Nigerian Digital Practices

Data Privacy: Instrumentalization versus Respect for Persons

The Nigerian data privacy environment shows that there is a deliberate breach of Kantian principles. Important protections are enshrined in the Nigeria Data Protection Act (NDPA) 2023, such as enhanced data protection regarding sensitive personal data and a requirement of registration of major processors (ICLG, 2025). Nonetheless, enforcement measures reveal a lack of compliance, with the NDPC examining more than 1,000 entities and fining them massively, including N766.2 million on Multichoice Nigeria (ICLG, 2025).

The data privacy environment in Nigeria shows that there are systematic infractions of Kantian principles. Nigeria Data Protection Act (NDPA) 2023 sets some significant safeguards such as increased protection on sensitive personal data and obligating significant processors to register (ICLG, 2025). Nevertheless, there is a high level of non-compliance as it has been reported that the NDPC has been investigating more than 1,000 organizations and imposing heavy fines, such as N766.2 million on Multichoice Nigeria (ICLG, 2025).

In Kantian terms, the core aspect of the problem is the treatment of the users by the digital platforms. Most services collect a lot of personal information not usually with any significant consent, and with little or no substantive value consideration. The practice goes against the humanity formulation by taking users as a source of valuable data but not as autonomous agents worthy of respect (Gwadi and Igbashangev, 2025). The legal requirements of the informed consent processes often do not provide Kantian transparency and are not rationally determined, since the legal texts they describe appear incomprehensible to users, and they are not really able to assess them.

The unequal treatment of the data subjects depending on the size of the processor is a breach of the principle of universalizability. It should be pointed out that, in

case privacy is a human right based on dignity, it has to be argued equally in spite of the financial size of the data controllers. Formation of levels of protection according to the size of the organization implicitly acknowledges that dignity may be violated when it comes to smaller organizations, a standpoint that cannot go hand in hand with Kantian ethics.

Nevertheless, there are those who justify the present day practice by stating that Kantian principles are not feasible in the digital world, and that they have to be absolute. Terms of service are voluntarily accepted by the user who is free to choose self-autonomously despite the complexity of the terms. The scaled regulation as a necessary response to economic constraints is justified by the fact that small businesses are not able to withstand compliance costs that are similar to those experienced by large corporations. Moreover, full disclosure of data practices may overload users with information, which is a counterproduct to free decision making instead of reinforcing it.

However, this defense does not value Kantian demands of meaningful autonomy. Consent that is made with terms that are intentionally obscure or a design pattern that is exploitative do not find a rational basis that is required of Kantian ethics. According to O'Neill (2002), real freedom needs to imply that people have access to information about the principles applicable in their treatment and can analyze them. By devising consent systems that deliberately aim to maximize acknowledgment at minimum understanding, digital platforms are driven to achieve strategic, but not communicative, objectives, which is a breach of the respect of the rational agency upon which the ethics of Kantians rests.

On scaled regulation, Kantian ethics does not allow different implementation methods but different moral standards. Human dignity should be observed by all data processors but small entities may have a more basic approach to attain this. The basic need, which is to treat people as ends, and not end as means, does not allow exceptions due to the size of the organization or the economic convenience.

Surveillance: State Power and Individual Dignity

The growing surveillance capacity, especially the social media intelligence (SOCMINT) by the security agencies adopted in Nigeria raises serious Kantian concerns (Stegen, 2025). The Cybercrimes Act permits electronic surveillance on the pretext of national security, but the routine monitoring of computer-mediated interactions where individuals do not know or consent to it disregards the imperative to handle persons as ends in themselves (Oghogho et al., 2024).

The universalizability test is informative: Would we tolerate a society in which we have government surveillance of all the digital communications? This type of universal surveillance would essentially change the very essence of the

communication as a process, taking away the trust and authenticity without which any meaningful discourse cannot be held. Under the supervision of the population, the autonomy that Kant regards as a crucial aspect to human dignity is denied to them since their words are constructed performances that they deliver in front of an unknown crowd instead of revealing themselves.

Surveillance systems also view citizens as potential dangers that need surveillance and not individuals who are independent and can govern themselves. Such instrumental orientation is offensive to the Kantian ethics even when the surveillance prevents actual harms, since it does not treat the dignity of the large majority that are not a threat seriously. The categorical imperative requires that the moral rules should apply to every human being across the board; to put in place a whole nation as the victims of surveillance due to the possibility of a few guilty of crimes to perpetrate crimes is instrumentalizing the majority who are innocent.

According to the advocates of surveillance, security threats such as terrorism, cyber crime and political instabilities generate valid demands of surveillance. The need to defend citizens can be used to justify surveillance to avoid grave harms by the state. In addition, the citizens who are involved in the open digital environments possess lower expectations about their privacy and therefore surveillance is not as invasive as a physical search. They think that the consequentialist advantages of such prevention of attack or crime supersede any abstract interests in dignity.

This defense, however, cannot succeed on the Kantian grounds since it considers dignity as something that can be exchanged towards security benefits. But the ethics of Kant is dignified as absolute and inviolable. Categorical imperative prohibits use of innocents to achieve security goals irrespective of the scale of returns attained. Due to the argument of Allen (2013), individuals are ethically obligated to uphold their informational privacy, but the states can not subjugate such obligations just because of the need of security.

Moreover, consequentialist calculation presented by the defenders of surveillance goes against the very framework of Kantian deontology. Although the harms prevented by surveillance may be minor, the question to ask whether the surveillance treats individuals with the respect to which their dignity is entitled. Massive surveillance that takes place without the awareness of individuals or without significant control does not pass this test. The ethics proposed by Kant allow taking of security measures, though in such a way that they do not interfere with the free agency of others, i.e. an element of transparency, responsibility and disproportion is needed, which is lacking in the existing surveillance procedures.

Misinformation: Truth-Telling and Democratic Discourse

Falsehoods over the Nigerian online fronts pose crucial dilemmas to the Kantian ethics. Truth-telling is considered a central concept in the Kantian moral system since lying breaches the principle of universalizability (universal lying would reduce trust to ashes, and people could no longer communicate) as well as the principle of respect to a person (lying would turn other people into objects to be used and not persons).

The 2023 elections in Nigeria painted the image of how misinformation can be corrosive. The use of social media influencers spread disinformation by the political parties that used ethnic and religious differences (Freedom House, 2024). Deepfakes that are produced through artificial intelligence pose a threat to future elections based on more advanced deceptions (Aigbiniode and Goodman, 2025). According to Kantian standpoint, such practices are systematic in breaching the rational autonomy required to engage in democracy, and instead of relating to the citizens as rational entities, who can make informed decisions, they relate citizens to objects, which are manipulated.

The obligation of truth is not just limited to individual actors, but also platform operators and policymakers. The social media companies that make their algorithms to encourage engagement instead of accuracy would be against the Kantian principles because they would have established the spaces in which misinformation can flourish. By platforms using cognitive biases to gain the greatest attention of users, the latter objectify them, as objects of advertisement revenue, but not independent agents who deserve to be told the truth. The Kantian imperative requires that the design of platforms put the interests of the user and the rational debate of the user over the commercial interests.

Electoral law in Nigeria does not allow any false statements made about candidates (Aigbiniode and Goodman, 2025), but the law is not properly enforced and does not correspond to new forms of manipulation. The gap in the overall AI and deepfake regulations means a lot in terms of guarding the integrity of information. Fact-checking such as MyAIFactChecker are good projects, though they need more involvement and spread into digital ecosystems to create an impact.

The critics can make the argument that the regulation of the flow of information is a menace to censorship, which is the opposite of the freedom of speech that the ethics of Kant also celebrate. Misinformation and the legitimate speech cannot be easily distinguished, and the enforcement mechanisms can be directed at the political enemies. In addition, individuals are obligated to think critically on the information; the state obligation to ensure that individuals tell the truth will

reduce the individuals to infantilism and the people will lack the right to make their own judgment.

These are important problems that should be considered seriously but they cannot comprehend the Kantian requirements. Although, the ethics of Kant do value the freedom of expression, it should occur in a manner that respects the autonomy of other individuals. Intentional misinformation violates this need because it seeks to distort, rather than inform. The categorical imperative prohibits no random censorship, but permit and even requires censorship that protects the contents of rational discourse. Other platforms must follow through with fact-checking systems and open content moderation without censoring acceptable points of view, as Gwadi and Igbashangev (2025) explain.

The challenge lies in the capacity to create the regulatory framework which will not rely on safeguarding rational discourse and inculcation of ideological conformity. The doctrine of Kantian ethics provides: universalizability of the interventions (that is, the ability to be applied to the actors regardless of their viewpoint), transparency (that is, the ability to make rational evaluations), and respectfulness of independent judgment (that is, should provide information, and should not prohibit access to it.). These principles support the activities like high profile labeling of provocative content and the antidote against wholesale censorship.

Policy Framework Enhancements

The Kantian ethics demand the Nigeria digital governance to be radically changed in which the human dignity is maintained by the need to consider commercial or political expediency. First, there should be equal treatment of data protection requirements to all the processors without the existence of tiered systems which compromise on privacy due to the magnitude of the organization. The NDPC must not only ensure the technical compliance but also the actual adherence to the user autonomy, the consent mechanisms applied must be made to guarantee actual comprehension and not artificial assent.

Second, the surveillance programs require radical transparency and accountability. Security measures are permitted by Kantian ethics, but only those measures, which consider citizens as an end in themselves. This involves including the warrant in the judicial review in order to engage in surveillance, regular publicity on size and performance of the programs, and huge compensations against the unsuitable surveillance. Security agencies must have the right to conduct surveillance based on individualized suspicion as opposed to entire populations as the source of potential dangers.

Third, Nigeria needs elaborate systems of AI and automated decision systems. Kantian ethics holds that the consequential determinations must be explainable and defendable which involves people in order to allow autonomous agents to understand and challenge determinations. To provide effective human jurisdiction and attractive mechanisms, decision-making algorithms to administer credit, jobs, or government services must be in accordance with the requirements of the transparency standards that respect human dignity.

Fourth, the regulation of platforms should be more about autonomy of the users and not about the engagement measures. This implies that the use of manipulative design patterns should be banned, putting algorithms transparent and making design choices in a manner that enables one to make a more informed choice. Although it should continue to protect the work of its users properly, platforms should be subject to legal liability as a systemic encouragement of misinformation.

Institutional Capacity Building

The use of the Kantian principles requires a more regulatory power. The NDPC and agencies in association with the NDPC are in need of resources to keep track of high-level technology, competence in morality structure, skills in technical expertise, and deficiency in political focus. The global partnership should not solely seek the capacity to enforcing but also work the policies on the values and priorities of the Nigerians and not merely import western ones.

The multi-stakeholder involvement comes in handy. Digital governance is not enforcementable but part of the ongoing communication between the government, civil societies, business community, and institutions of higher learning. It is not just that such discussions are expected to deliberate on how it should be implemented technically, but also answers simple questions such as what is expected to be the correct relationship between technology and human flourishing in the Nigerian society.

Digital Literacy and Public Education

Kantian autonomy requires informed citizens who are rational. Nigeria should invest in multilevel digital literacy policies which would encompass the privacy rights, discernment of misinformation and informed decision-making when it comes to digital services. These programs are not meant to be limited to the urban educated individuals but to the rural and the marginal groups which are most vulnerable.

Technology education should be more based on moral reasoning of technology rather than technical skills. There should be mechanisms that enable the citizens to evaluate how digital practices are taking away their dignity and autonomy so

that they can insist on the platforms and policymakers to treat them better. Digital ethics must be introduced to schools and young Nigerians must learn to survive in the technological space without losing their sense of morality.

Balancing Innovation and Dignity

Nigeria has massive potential in the development of its digital economy. To bring these benefits to a reality in the world, it is quite a challenge to uphold the Kantian imperative of persons never being used as a means to an end alone. It includes the rejection of spurious distinctions between innovation and ethics, and the perception that sustainable digital economies must be founded on the issues of trust and dignity.

Innovation should not be stifled by moral principles since it should be upheld using specific tenets concerning responsible development. The business constructors who take into account the user autonomy and dignity are able to create stable business and those ones who rely on exploitation create poor systems that are susceptible to regulatory measures and protests. The Kantian ethics will thus not only provide a guideline of how to be controlled but also provide a model on how to conduct business that would satisfy the needs of commerce and moral demands.

Conclusion

This discussion shows that categorical imperative by Kant offers formidable instruments to review and transform Nigeria online habits. The standard of persons as ends in themselves criticizes the common practices in data collection, surveillance and misinformation that commercializes citizens to either commercial or political agendas. The test of universalizability demonstrates the inconsistency of existing practices, the fact that a practice that has been tolerated in narrow circumstances would be self-destructive should universal application be undertaken.

The digital governance of Nigeria has a wide gap between the formal protections and the achieved justice. Although the NDPA 2023 sets significant legal guidelines, their enforcement is still unsatisfactory and latent practices tend to contradict the Kantian principles. The way in which data platforms deal with users is based on valuing them as sources of important information, rather than viewing them as independent agents who should be respected. The surveillance systems are used to monitor whole populations on the basis of the possible danger rather than on personal suspicion. Misinformation campaigns exploit citizens instead of acting as a source of information to their rational thinking.

However, the Kantian paradigm provides optimism as well as criticism. It offers practical reforms to respect human value and yet allow technological advancements by giving straight forward moral principles namely, dignity, autonomy, and universalizability. The above recommendations will show how the Kantian ethics can be applied when framing certain policies on data privacy, accountability in suicide attempts by surveillance, regulation of the platform, and integrity of information.

The issues of implementation are still daunting. The capacity of regulations is constrained by the scarcity of resources. The Kantian individualism can be in conflicts with cultural contexts. Political forces oppose reforms that pose threat to the conventional interests. Vulnerable populations are not covered and excluded due to the digital divide. These challenges require life long dedication and imaginative modification as opposed to the sacrifice of moral demands to expediency.

The status of Nigeria as the most advanced digital economy in Africa opens opportunities to be the first to find ways of creating a balance between innovation and humanity. The Kantian approach to digital governance will ensure that the country develops frameworks that can be used in all new markets and prove that technological advancement does not have to harm human value. The decision open to Nigeria is clear either to keep abiding by digital practices that view persons as means to commercial and political ends or devote oneself to frameworks that regard dignity and autonomy that Kant has at the core of moral life.

Research directions of the future should focus on certain mechanisms of implementation, the cultural application of the Kantian principles to the Nigerian setting, and the comparison with the other emerging digital economies. The policy of enforcement effectiveness and the general understanding of digital rights could be supported by the empirical studies of these two factors that would enhance the knowledge base in developing the policy. However, the basic ethical lesson is that in the realm of the digital (as in any other field) individuals are to be treated as ends (not means) to purposes of other people.

References

- Aigbiniode, I., & Goodman, F. (2025, August 28). *Road to 2027: Preparing for Nigerian elections in a world of AI deepfakes*. TechCabal. <https://techcabal.com/2025/08/28/ai-deepfakes-nigeria-2027-elections/>

- Allen, A. (2013). An Ethical Duty to Protect One's Own Information Privacy?
Alabama Law Review.
https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty_scholarship/451/
- Fagbemi, J. (2025, September 22). *Digital economy contributes 14.4% of Nigeria's GDP growth in Q2 2025*. Technext.
<https://technext24.com/2025/09/22/digital-economy-contribute-14-nigeria/>
- Freedom House. (2024). *Nigeria: Freedom on the Net 2024 Country Report*. Freedom House.
<https://freedomhouse.org/country/nigeria/freedom-net/2024>
- Future of Privacy Forum. (2023, June 28). *Nigeria's New Data Protection Act, Explained*. <https://fpf.org/blog/nigerias-new-data-protection-act-explained/>
- Gwadi, I. W., & Igbashangev, P. A. (2025). Evaluating the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Fact-Checking Social Media Content in Nigeria. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5015986>
- ICLG. (2025). *Data Protection Laws and Regulations Nigeria 2025*. International Comparative Legal Guides. <https://iclg.com/practice-areas/data-protection-laws-and-regulations/nigeria>
- Johnson, R., & Cureton, A. (2022). *Kant's Moral Philosophy*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/>
- Kant, I. (1993). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals* (J. W. Ellington, Trans.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1785)
- MDIF. (2024, November 6). "The power of visual evidence is under threat": What do Nigerian elections teach us? MDIF.
<https://www.mdif.org/news/the-power-of-visual-evidence-is-under-threat-what-do-nigerian-elections-teach-us/>
- O'Neill, O. (2002). *Autonomy and trust in bioethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oghogho, M. Y., Osazuwa, O. M. C., Iyamba, O. D., Ekeng-Ekeng, H., & John, I. G. (2024). Enhancing Security in Nigeria: The Implications of Social Media-Based Crime Reporting. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, 6(9), 22–39.
<https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/volume06issue09-05>
- Securiti. (2023). *An Overview of Nigeria's Data Protection Act, 2023*. Securiti.
<https://securiti.ai/overview-of-nigeria-data-protection-act/>
- Stegen, J. I. (2025). Leveraging social media intelligence (SOCMINT) in the African intelligence context. *Journal of Policing Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 20(2), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18335330.2025.2465529>

- Ulgen, O. (2017, October 31). *Kantian Ethics in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics*. QIL QDI. <https://www.qil-qdi.org/kantian-ethics-age-artificial-intelligence-robotics/>
- Wolfenden, K.-L. (2025, August 25). *Nigeria Probes 1,369 Organizations in Major Data Privacy Crackdown*. TechAfrica News. <https://techafricanews.com/2025/08/25/nigeria-probes-1369-organizations-in-major-data-privacy-crackdown/>