✠ MOTUS SALUTIS VIRTUALIS

*Exhortation Letter on Digital Governance and the Protection of Life
Connected World*

> *"Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God."*
> *1 John 4:1*

I. The Diagnosis of Now – The Exposed World

We live in a time when the world no longer fits only into streets, homes, schools, and temples.
It fits — and bleeds — inside lit screens.

The boundary between the public and the intimate has silently collapsed. Life has become transmissible in real time, and with it came the pains, fragilities, immaturities, and wounds of people who were never prepared to live under permanent spotlights. What would once have been an adolescent secret, a correctable mistake, a passing phase, can today be captured, replicated, and fossilized in archives, screenshots, and invisible databases.

Children and adolescents walk through this space as if crossing an unknown city without a map and without an adult nearby. They enter platforms that speak their language, use colors that seduce them, algorithms trained to keep them hooked, and there find themselves exposed to content, people, and dynamics far beyond their emotional and psychological maturity.

Childhood — a time of protection and gradualness — is being pierced by stimuli that no previous generation was ever asked to face.

At the same time, the digital environment has become fertile ground for mass radicalization. Extremist groups have learned to operate with surgical precision upon human vulnerability: they offer belonging to the lonely, ready-made identity to the confused, simple answers to those who suffer under the world's complexity. Digital cults, ideological sects, hate communities, and fanatic niches today form true "parallel churches" of disinformation, with their own liturgies, charismatic leaders, and implicit rules of obedience.

This is not merely about strong opinions or heated debates.
It is about entire communities trained to dehumanize the different, to attack, persecute, cancel, threaten, until the line between disagreement and symbolic — and often physical — violence dissolves.
The screen, which could have been a bridge, becomes a trench.

Beneath this visible surface flows an even darker subsoil.
In encrypted zones, closed networks, and the less accessible corners of the so-called dark web, illicit markets and criminal practices remain in operation, preying precisely upon those who should be most protected: children, adolescents, vulnerable people.

There circulate images and videos of criminal material involving minors, exchanges of abusive content, human trafficking networks, sexual exploitation schemes, drug and arms trade, extortion structures, blackmail, and recruitment. Many of these spaces are shielded by layers of anonymity and encryption that hinder — or delay — coordinated state action.

Meanwhile, open platforms that present themselves as spaces for coexistence and entertainment reproduce, on an industrial scale, a constant logic of hypersexualization.
Childhood is summoned to skip stages; adolescence is trained to perform seduction, exposure, self-display. Bodies still learning how to exist are turned into product, storefront, currency in exchange for attention and likes.

The culture of engagement, blind to the inner rhythms of the human soul, transforms intimacy into content and vulnerability into spectacle.

Algorithms, designed to maximize screen time and user retention, have learned something simple and dangerous:
emotionally, pain holds attention.

Content that provokes shock, indignation, desire, fear, or fury tends to keep people engaged longer. And thus, without an "explicitly evil intention," but driven by the cold logic of efficiency and profit, system creators ended up building environments that amplify violence, hate speech, public lynchings, exhausting identity disputes, deadly challenges, displayed self-harm, and despair turned into entertainment.

At the edges of all this, millions become easy targets:

— children and adolescents without a formed internal filter;
— young people consuming references that confuse identity, affection, and self-image;
— emotionally fragile adults captured by narratives promising meaning, family, community;
— people in psychic suffering pushed by algorithms toward content that worsens their pain;
— survivors of trauma re-victimized by the eternal exposure of records that should never have existed.

There is, therefore, a common thread running through all this:
the most vulnerable walk unprotected through a territory designed for something else — to engage, monetize, retain, profit — not to educate, care for, or protect.

The result is a world where:

exposure is permanent;
intimacy has lost its shelter;
radicalization finds fertile ground;
organized crime professionalizes digitally;
childhood loses layers of innocence;
adolescence carries an unbearable weight of self-image;
and much of humanity lives connected without knowing how to defend itself, how to discern, how to say "no."

It is in this scenario — real, uncomfortable, often silenced — that this letter is born.
Not as an impotent lament, but as an honest recognition of a civilizational wound:

we created a digital environment of immense power without building, at the same speed, the instruments of protection, care, and responsibility it demands.

Before speaking of laws, regulation, pacts, and governance, we must face this hard truth:
the current architecture of the virtual world exposes too much, protects too little, and often delivers the most fragile to the most predatory forces.

To see this, name this, admit this — is already the first movement of salvation.
The **motus salutis virtualis** begins here: in the refusal to normalize what harms, in the act of saying, clearly, that something is profoundly wrong in how we let our children, youth, and vulnerable people walk through this territory.

From this diagnosis arises the inevitable next question:
where are the authorities, the States, the international institutions that should safeguard the common good in this new frontier?

This is the question that opens the second movement of this letter.

II. The Silence of the Structures – When Those Who Should Guard Become Opaque

Faced with such a grave scenario, the question imposes itself with almost physical force:

where are those who should have raised their hands earlier?

Where are the States, the international institutions, the multilateral organizations, the global foundations, the councils of ethics, the summits that gather annually to speak of "the future," "innovation," "democracy"?

For decades, the world watched the expansion of digital infrastructure as one watches a firework show: with fascination, wonder, and a certain irresponsible awe.
Much was said about connectivity, inclusion, progress, the Fourth Industrial Revolution, economic opportunity.
Forums, panels, slogans, reports were created.
But in many cases, the question of protection, responsibility, and limits was always left for later.

Governments largely behaved as spectators of a game they imagined they did not control. They preferred the rhetoric of innovation to the courage of regulation. Meanwhile, global companies grew in reach, profit, and influence, while democracies remained trapped in analog legal structures written for a pre-digital world.

Legislative slowness became a recurrent trait. Laws arise late, after tragedies, scandals, irreversible harm. They rarely anticipate. They almost never look toward children, vulnerable families, digital peripheries without a voice in debates.

Thus, what should be a guaranteed right — the protection of human dignity in any environment — has been suspended in a gray zone, where the market sets the pace and the State runs behind, always one step late.

On the international stage, the void is even more evident.

Despite the global dimension of the internet, there is no robust architecture of worldwide digital governance. There are committees, meetings, resolutions, well-intentioned reports. But no organism with a clear mandate, resources, and legitimacy to coordinate concrete actions, establish minimum standards, monitor violations, demand corrections, and hold economic and political actors accountable.

The UN, expected to be the moral and political conscience of the international community, still crawls in constructing effective instruments for the virtual world. UNESCO, whose vocation is to

protect education, culture, science, and information, is slow to fully occupy the space it should as an ethical guardian of digital formation for new generations.

Between good declarations and timid initiatives, children remain exposed, adolescents continue to be recruited, entire populations continue to be manipulated by systems that cross borders without encountering limits.

There is a lack of binding global pacts.
A lack of international conventions treating digital space as we treat the seas, climate, trade, and arms.
A lack of stable bodies to monitor, on a planetary scale, the impacts of platforms on childhood, democracy, collective mental health, and the integrity of public debate.

Global civil society has likewise not fully awakened to the urgency of having organizations dedicated exclusively to the digital protection of the vulnerable. There are important efforts, valuable initiatives, heroic projects. But they are islands in a stormy ocean.

As a result, the environment that shapes the imagination, relationships, identities, and affections of billions remains largely without a protection network equivalent to its formative power.

Even in advanced democracies, the logic is reactive.
When faced with disinformation events, electoral interference, hate crimes, and data leaks, institutions hold hearings, create commissions, announce investigations. But everything still happens as a response to crises, not as a civilizational project.

Meanwhile, transnational corporations operate with resources, technologies, and access to data that many States do not possess. They move globally, negotiate directly with governments, influence policies, fund research, sponsor events, set technical standards. In many contexts, they have become faster, more efficient, and in certain aspects more powerful than the very countries in which they operate.

This is not about demonizing companies — many employ serious, ethical professionals.
It is about recognizing a structural imbalance:

on one side, slow state structures with limited budgets and outdated legal frameworks;
on the other, private organizations with almost unlimited resources, privileged access to data, and the capacity to influence behavior at scale, minute by minute, screen by screen.

In this tilted field, the first to lose are always the same:
the small, the anonymous, the vulnerable.

A civilizational failure is unfolding.
It is not merely that individuals commit abuses in the digital world; the structures that should guarantee limits, protection, and justice have not assumed, with necessary firmness, their historical responsibility.

The result is a type of silent abandonment:

States delegate too much to the market;
international organizations dissolve into declarations;
civil society has not yet organized at the required scale;
religious, educational, and cultural institutions are slow to understand the depth of the phenomenon;

professionals in health, law, and social assistance still struggle to translate the impact of digital life into technical language.

This vacuum, this hesitation, this slowness allows less scrupulous forces to occupy the space.
Where the public power delays, organized crime innovates.
Where legislation is timid, exploitation becomes bold.
Where the international community relativizes, violence finds breaches.

Therefore, this letter is not only an appeal to individuals — parents, educators, young people, network users.
It is also a direct call to structures of power:

— to governments, to recognize the digital sphere as a central political and ethical territory, not a peripheral one;
— to parliaments, to legislate with courage, listening to science, families, and the signs of youth suffering;
— to the UN and UNESCO, to stop treating the virtual world as an appendix and embrace it as a strategic axis of human rights protection;
— to constitutional courts, to affirm clearly that human dignity is not suspended in the digital environment;
— to networks of civil society organizations, to integrate the digital dimension into every agenda of social justice;
— to communities of faith, to understand care with technology as part of the mission to protect life at all stages.

We have reached a point where diagnosis alone is no longer enough.
Recognizing the problem is necessary, but insufficient.
The time for mere observation is ending.

If the world continues treating the digital environment as an "accessory" to reality, rather than a structuring space of human experience, we will see grow, year after year, a generation formed in unstable terrain, without consolidated ethical grounding or clear frameworks of protection.

Thus, after naming abandonment, this letter must speak of the next step:
not merely denouncing silence, but calling for a true architecture of governance and shared responsibility capable of protecting, educating, and guiding the use of technology toward the good.

This movement opens in the next block.

III. An Architecture of Governance – When Care Becomes System

If diagnosis reveals the wound and the silence of structures evidences abandonment, the next step cannot be indignation alone. We must design paths.

The **motus salutis virtualis** is not realized in beautiful phrases, but in structures that sustain, over time, the care that today depends too heavily on individual goodwill.
The protection of life in the digital environment must cease to be a favor and become an organized obligation assumed by multiple actors in shared responsibility.

Governance here is not synonymous with authoritarian control or blind censorship.
Governance is the art of placing limits where power threatens human dignity.

It is weaving, in network, rules, practices, institutions, and routines that ensure three fundamental verbs: prevent, protect, and repair.

It begins at home, but it does not end there.

1. National Pacts: The Ground of Each Country

Every nation urgently needs to consolidate clear legal frameworks recognizing the digital environment as a real extension of social life. This is not about creating isolated technological islands, but affirming with courage that:

what is a crime outside the screen is also a crime within it;
what harms the dignity of a physical body also harms when directed at a body exposed in pixels;
what violates childhood on the street also violates it in videos, private rooms, encrypted chats.

Data protection laws, child and adolescent statutes, penal codes, advertising regulations, platform responsibility rules: all must speak to each other, forming a coherent system, not a mosaic of exceptions.

It is not enough to punish after; prevention must come before.

This implies:

requiring platforms to adopt protective default settings for minors;
strictly limiting the collection and use of data from children and adolescents;
restricting algorithms that push inappropriate content to vulnerable age groups;
creating agile mechanisms for reporting, removing abusive content, and holding accountable those who profit from indecent exposure.

The Executive, Legislative, and Judiciary must not work in silos.
They must form permanent fronts of digital governance, listening to civil society, families, and the scientific community to continuously review laws and public policies in light of technological transformation.

2. International Pacts: Protecting What Crosses Borders

The digital environment is, by nature, transnational.
Thus, no country, however courageous, can protect its population fully if it walks alone.

It is time to advance toward binding international pacts that cover topics such as:

global combat against child pornography and human trafficking on digital platforms;
minimum standards of algorithmic transparency and verification;
cooperation between police forces, prosecutors, and regulatory agencies for complex digital crimes;
protocols for temporary suspension of services that systematically refuse to comply with judicial protection orders;
global metrics to assess the impact of networks on mental health, especially among youth.

The UN and UNESCO have central roles here — not to impose ready-made models, but to articulate convergences, offer negotiation spaces, fund independent research, support countries with fewer resources, and create international observatories for monitoring the effects of technology on childhood, democracy, and society.

3. Observatories and Laboratories – Lucidity That Watches in Real Time

In a world where reality changes as fast as an app update, it is not enough to create laws and stop following them.
We must see, measure, interpret.

Hence the importance of digital observatories: interdisciplinary, autonomous spaces dedicated to monitoring:

patterns of hate speech, manipulation, and radicalization;
tendencies of hypersexualization and exploitation of the vulnerable;
new modes of recruitment, blackmail, and exposure;
impacts of platforms on the mental health and self-perception of children and adolescents;
effects of generative AI on disinformation, fake images, deepfakes, and the deformation of reality.

Alongside them, ethical vigilance laboratories can continually test new technologies, AI models, and platform functionalities, simulating risk scenarios before products reach mass scale.

Ethics should be subject to the same rigor as engineering:
no system capable of affecting millions should be released without stress tests assessing consequences on vulnerable groups, privacy, freedom of expression, and behavior manipulation.

4. Co-responsibility of Intermediary Bodies

Governance cannot be effective if restricted to governments and companies.
Intermediate bodies of society must assume their roles:

religious institutions with their unmatched capillarity;
schools and universities forming critical thinking;
professional councils in health, psychology, social service, law, technology;
civil society organizations, community movements, youth collectives;
responsible media willing to go deeper than sensational headlines.

Each can and must take part in the mission:

educating families for conscious digital use;
supporting youth in building identity that does not depend solely on digital approval;
training professionals to identify signs of digital-related suffering;
providing counseling to victims of online violence;
denouncing abusive practices by platforms and advertisers;
proposing ethical codes, commitment seals, awareness campaigns.

Faith communities, in particular, can serve as places of healing and reorientation for those wounded by digital battles: exhausted adolescents, prematurely sexualized children, adults consumed by screen addiction, people humiliated by indecent exposure.
Mature spirituality can rebuild the sense of value no engagement metric can offer.

5. Frontline Professionals – Those Who See the Pain Must Be Heard

On the frontlines are those who deal daily with the consequences of the connected world:

teachers seeing distracted, anxious, fragmented students;
psychologists treating youth whose disorders are worsened by endless comparisons and cyberbullying;
social workers witnessing families destabilized by digital exploitation;
pediatricians noticing altered sleep, mood, appetite;
guardianship counselors and justice operators handling cases of abuse, exposure, and recruitment.

Their voices must guide governance design.
No public policy is effective without listening to lived reality.

Governance, regulation, pacts, observatories, laboratories, co-responsibility: together, these compose an architecture of care.

This is not about erecting walls around technology, but about building a garden with clear boundaries, where life can flourish without being crushed by disordered forces.

The **motus salutis virtualis** demands exactly this:
that concern for the digital impact on human dignity cease to be the concern of a few and become a structured commitment of many.

Only then can we look at technology freely, without fear, because we have learned to place it in its proper place: not as master of human destiny, but as a tool at the service of goodness, justice, and the lucid expansion of consciousness.

From this foundation, the final movement of this letter opens: contemplating, with hope, what technology can be when placed under the sign of virtue, prudence, and love for humanity.

IV. The Luminous Possibility – When Technology Becomes an Ally of Life

If we have spoken of wounds, omissions, and responsibilities, it was not to conclude that the digital world is lost, nor that fear is the only response.

Quite the opposite.
The **motus salutis virtualis** exists precisely because we believe, with serene radicality, that technology can be one of the greatest allies of good when placed under the guard of conscience and ethics.

The same human intelligence that built networks, clouds, codes, and AI models is the intelligence that, throughout history, built hospitals, universities, libraries, astronomical observatories, cathedrals, and research centers.
The impulse that programs algorithms today is the kin of the impulse that designed musical instruments, translated ancient scriptures, deciphered the human genome, mapped the night sky.

Technology is not a deviation; it is a gift — an extension of our capacity to create, organize, express, and understand.

When we look at it this way, something shifts:
we stop seeing it merely as a threat and start seeing it as a field of transfiguration.

With responsible governance, clear limits, and a lucid heart, the digital world can become:

a space of expanded consciousness where people from different cultures and ages access knowledge once restricted to a few;
a laboratory of shared wisdom, where scientists, artists, philosophers, educators, and traditional communities exchange insight in real time;
a powerful instrument of integral education, supporting children and youth with interactive, inclusive resources;
a channel for scientific discovery, accelerating research in health, environment, renewable energy, food security, biodiversity;
a fertile ground for interdisciplinarity, where knowledge fields become bridges;
a locus of real interculturality, where peoples exchange languages, stories, songs, memories;
a medium of global collaboration around common causes: combating poverty, confronting climate crisis, protecting oceans, eradicating preventable diseases.

In this horizon, artificial intelligence ceases to be a ghost and becomes a prodigious tool:

helping doctors diagnose earlier;
supporting teachers in personalized learning;
offering accessibility to people with disabilities;
translating languages and reducing symbolic distances;
organizing massive information for science, justice, public transparency.

When guided by strong principles, AI can even expand the field of empathy: helping us see distant realities, hear silenced voices, better understand the pains and hopes of other peoples and generations.

But all this requires a clear choice:
placing each human life — especially minors — at the center of the digital project.

This means:

protecting every stage of life so none is exploited or discarded;
ensuring children grow with technology, but not subordinated to it;
allowing adolescents to express themselves without becoming prisoners of engagement metrics;
offering young adults tools to work, study, dream without being trapped in cycles of exhaustion;
welcoming the elderly and helping them connect without fear.

An ethically governed digital world can become a soil of human flourishing:

where hidden talents emerge, vocations are discovered, solidarities woven, and spirituality finds new languages to speak of love, justice, humility, care.

This is not about idealizing a perfect future, but about recognizing that, between dystopia and paralyzing utopia, there is a real path: the path of **conscious transfiguration**, where we look at technology without naivety or cynicism and say:

"You will become what we make of you.
And we choose to place you at the service of life."

This letter, therefore, is less an ending than a beginning — an invitation:

for countries to legislate and protect;
for international bodies to stop postponing the inevitable and build global pacts;
for platforms to review their business models in light of human dignity;

for educators, families, and communities to unite in a culture of attentive, critical, loving use of technologies;
for researchers and developers to embed ethics as their baseline code;
for spiritual institutions to understand that caring for souls today includes caring for screens.

The **motus salutis virtualis** is ultimately a call:
not to go backward, but to ascend.

Not to deny the digital, but to inhabit it with humanity, justice, humility, and light.

May every person, institution, and nation feel called to take a concrete step — large or small, visible or silent — toward this governance of the good.

Because the connected world we build today will simply be the world the next generations inherit.

May they find, upon arriving, not a minefield but prepared ground.
Not a labyrinth of exploitation but a path of growth.
Not an indifferent machine, but a space where technology reflects the best in us:

the capacity to care, to learn, to create, to protect, and to love.

**May Jesus Christ✛ bless us and guide us with His infinite love and divine mercy, that we may better discern what lies ahead and face the urgent challenges we cannot renounce.
For our little ones. For the dignity of peoples, and for peace.**

Sacra Virtus Existentiae

Lucas Dalenogare
School of Conscious Transfiguration
Jan/2026