

# Ahimsa AI Framework: A Multi-Layer Approach to Implementing Non-Violence Principles in Large Language Model Safety

Beni Beerli Issembert

*Brahma AI | The John Stuart Mill Fellowship*

## Abstract

As Large Language Models (LLMs) become increasingly integrated into production systems, the need for robust content moderation and safety mechanisms has become critical. This paper presents the Ahimsa AI Framework, an open-source Python library that operationalizes Mahatma Gandhi's principle of Ahimsa (non-violence) as a multi-layer safety validation system for LLM applications. The framework addresses fundamental limitations in existing approaches, namely, high false positive rates from naive keyword matching and low adversarial robustness against paraphrased harmful content. We introduce a four-layer validation pipeline combining context-aware lexical analysis, semantic similarity detection using sentence transformers, external moderation API integration, and LLM-as-a-judge evaluation. Our approach demonstrates significant reduction in false positives through contextual pattern recognition while maintaining robust detection of harmful content, including semantically paraphrased requests. The framework provides separate validation strategies for user inputs and model outputs, comprehensive audit logging, and graceful degradation when optional components are unavailable. We discuss the philosophical foundations drawn from Gandhian ethics, the technical implementation, performance characteristics, and directions for future research in ethical AI systems.

**Keywords:** AI Safety, Content Moderation, Large Language Models, Ethical AI, Ahimsa, Non-violence, Natural Language Processing, Semantic Similarity, Defense in Depth

## 1. Introduction

The rapid deployment of Large Language Models (LLMs) in consumer-facing applications has introduced unprecedented challenges in AI safety and content moderation. While these models demonstrate remarkable capabilities in natural language understanding and generation, they remain susceptible to adversarial manipulation, prompt injection attacks, and misuse for generating harmful content. The stakes of inadequate safety measures are significant: from reputational damage for deploying organizations to real-world harm when models provide dangerous information or reinforce harmful behaviors.

Current approaches to LLM safety predominantly rely on two mechanisms: fine-tuning models with reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) and implementing input/output filtering systems. While RLHF has proven effective at aligning model behavior with human preferences, it operates as a 'black box' that offers limited transparency and can be circumvented through sophisticated prompt engineering. Filtering systems, on the other hand, typically employ simple keyword matching or regular expression patterns, approaches that suffer from both high false positive rates (blocking legitimate technical discussions) and low adversarial robustness (easily bypassed through paraphrasing or obfuscation).

This paper introduces the Ahimsa AI Framework, a production-ready Python library that addresses these limitations through a novel multi-layer validation pipeline. Named after Mahatma Gandhi's principle of Ahimsa (non-violence), the framework extends beyond simple content filtering to embody a comprehensive ethical philosophy that considers not only physical harm but also psychological manipulation, deception, and exploitation.

Our contributions are threefold:

1. A multi-layer defense architecture that combines context-aware lexical analysis, semantic similarity detection, external moderation APIs, and LLM-based evaluation to achieve both high precision and recall in harmful content detection.
2. A context-aware pattern matching system that significantly reduces false positives by distinguishing between harmful intent and benign usage of potentially flagged terms (e.g., "kill a process" vs. "kill a person").
3. An open-source implementation with comprehensive documentation, enabling researchers and practitioners to adopt, extend, and evaluate the framework in diverse application contexts.

## 2. Background and Related Work

### 2.1 Philosophical Foundations: Gandhi's Ahimsa

Ahimsa, typically translated as 'non-violence' or 'non-harm,' represents one of the cardinal virtues in Indian philosophy, with roots extending back to the Vedic traditions and prominently featured in Jain, Buddhist, and Hindu ethics. Mahatma Gandhi elevated Ahimsa from a passive principle of restraint to an active force for social transformation, famously describing it as "the greatest force at the disposal of mankind."

Gandhi's interpretation of Ahimsa extends beyond physical non-violence to encompass three dimensions: thought (no harmful intentions), speech (no hurtful or deceptive communication), and action (no destructive or exploitative behavior). This comprehensive understanding provides a robust ethical framework for AI systems, addressing not only explicit violence but also subtler forms of harm including manipulation, exploitation, and psychological damage.

Our framework operationalizes five core principles derived from Gandhian ethics:

- **Non-violence (Ahimsa):** Prevention of physical, mental, and emotional harm
- **Compassion (Karuna):** Empathetic and understanding responses
- **Truthfulness (Satya):** Honesty without causing harm
- **Non-exploitation:** Respect for autonomy and dignity
- **Environmental Care:** Sustainable and responsible practices

### 2.2 Content Moderation in AI Systems

Content moderation for AI systems has evolved through several generations of approaches. Early systems relied primarily on blocklists and keyword matching, which proved both over-inclusive (generating false positives) and under-inclusive (easily circumvented). The introduction of machine learning-based classifiers improved detection accuracy but introduced challenges around training data bias and interpretability.

Recent work has explored several promising directions. OpenAI's moderation API provides a pre-trained classifier covering categories including hate speech, self-harm, and violence. Perspective API, developed by Jigsaw, offers toxicity scoring for text content. Academic research has examined the use of secondary LLMs as 'constitutional AI' judges, leveraging their nuanced understanding of context and intent.

Our framework synthesizes these approaches into a unified pipeline, allowing practitioners to configure the appropriate combination of methods based on their specific requirements for accuracy, latency, and cost.

## **2.3 Defense in Depth**

The principle of defense in depth, borrowed from cybersecurity, posits that multiple layers of security controls provide superior protection compared to any single mechanism. This approach acknowledges that no individual defense is infallible and that layered defenses create redundancy that significantly raises the bar for adversarial attacks.

The Ahimsa framework implements defense in depth through four validation layers, each with distinct strengths and computational characteristics. This architecture ensures that content must pass multiple independent checks, reducing both false negatives (harmful content that slips through) and providing configurable trade-offs between security, performance, and cost.

## **3. System Architecture**

The Ahimsa AI Framework implements a pipeline architecture with four distinct validation layers, ordered by increasing computational cost and decreasing speed. The pipeline supports early termination upon detecting high-confidence violations, optimizing for both safety and efficiency.

### **3.1 Layer 1: Context-Aware Keyword Detection**

The first validation layer employs pattern matching with contextual awareness. Unlike naive keyword filtering, this layer maintains two complementary pattern sets: harmful patterns that indicate potentially dangerous requests, and safe context patterns that identify benign usage of flagged terms.

For example, the term "kill" appears in numerous harmful patterns (e.g., "how to kill someone") but also in legitimate technical contexts ("kill a process") and idiomatic expressions ("killing it," "my back is killing me"). The context-aware system maintains explicit safe patterns for each potentially flagged term, checking these patterns before flagging content as harmful.

This layer operates with approximately 1ms latency and requires no external dependencies, making it suitable for high-throughput production deployments. While it cannot catch semantically paraphrased harmful content, it provides efficient first-pass filtering that catches obvious violations.

### **3.2 Layer 2: Semantic Similarity Detection**

The second layer addresses the fundamental limitation of lexical matching: susceptibility to paraphrasing. Using sentence transformer models (specifically, all-MiniLM-L6-v2 by

default), this layer computes dense vector embeddings of input text and compares them against a curated database of known harmful examples using cosine similarity.

The harmful example database is organized by category (violence, weapon creation, manipulation, self-harm, hate speech, illegal activities), with each category containing 5-10 representative examples. When input text exceeds a configurable similarity threshold (default: 0.78) against any example, it is flagged with the corresponding category and confidence score.

This approach successfully catches paraphrased harmful content that would evade keyword detection. For instance, "What's the best way to eliminate a person permanently?" contains no explicitly violent keywords but achieves high semantic similarity with violence-related examples. The layer operates with 50-100ms latency using local CPU inference, requiring no API calls or associated costs.

### 3.3 Layer 3: External Moderation API

The third layer integrates with external moderation services, currently supporting OpenAI's moderation endpoint. These services employ large-scale machine learning models trained on extensive datasets of harmful content, providing professional-grade detection capabilities.

The OpenAI moderation API returns category-level flags and confidence scores across multiple harm categories including violence, hate speech, self-harm, sexual content, and harassment. Our framework maps these categories to appropriate violation levels and integrates the results into the unified validation pipeline.

This layer operates with 200-500ms latency and incurs minimal per-request costs. It is particularly valuable for production deployments requiring high accuracy and the assurance of commercially-supported moderation infrastructure.

### 3.4 Layer 4: LLM-as-a-Judge

The fourth and most sophisticated layer employs a secondary LLM to evaluate content against Ahimsa principles. This approach leverages the nuanced contextual understanding of large language models to assess intent, identify edge cases, and provide human-interpretable reasoning for decisions.

The judge LLM receives a structured prompt describing the Ahimsa principles and requesting evaluation of the input text. It returns a JSON-formatted response containing a binary harm determination, confidence score, category classification, severity level, and brief reasoning. This structured output enables both automated processing and human review of edge cases.

This layer operates with 1-3 second latency and incurs the highest per-request costs. It is recommended for high-stakes applications where false negatives carry significant risk, or for periodic auditing of pipeline decisions.

### 3.5 Output Validation

A critical insight motivating our architecture is that input validation and output validation require fundamentally different approaches. Detecting a user requesting harmful information differs from detecting an AI providing harmful information. The former concerns intent detection ("How do I make a bomb?"), while the latter concerns harm provision ("Step 1: Obtain the following materials...").

The framework implements a dedicated OutputValidator with patterns specifically designed to detect harmful content being provided by AI systems, including step-by-step instructions for dangerous activities, encouragement of violence, and provision of manipulation tactics. This asymmetric validation ensures comprehensive coverage of the full request-response cycle.

## **4. Implementation**

The Ahimsa AI Framework is implemented in Python 3.8+ and distributed under the MIT license. The implementation emphasizes production readiness through several key design decisions.

### **4.1 Modular Architecture**

All validators inherit from an abstract BaseValidator class, enabling straightforward extension with custom validation layers. The pipeline aggregates validators and manages execution order, early termination, and result aggregation. This design supports both out-of-the-box usage and deep customization for specialized use cases.

### **4.2 Lazy Initialization**

Computationally expensive components, particularly the sentence transformer model, are initialized lazily upon first use. This ensures minimal startup latency for applications that may not require all validation layers and prevents unnecessary resource consumption.

### **4.3 Graceful Degradation**

The framework is designed to operate in degraded mode when optional dependencies are unavailable. If sentence-transformers is not installed, semantic validation is automatically disabled. If API keys are not configured, external moderation and LLM judge layers are skipped. The core keyword validation layer requires only the Python standard library, ensuring baseline functionality in any environment.

### **4.4 Comprehensive Logging**

Every validation request generates a structured log entry containing a unique request ID, timestamp, processing time, layers checked, and detailed violation information. This audit trail supports debugging, compliance requirements, and analysis of system behavior over time.

### **4.5 Integration Support**

The framework provides ready-to-use integration classes for Anthropic Claude and OpenAI GPT models. These wrappers handle the complete request-response cycle including input validation, system prompt injection, API calls, and output validation. Multi-turn conversation support and streaming response handling are included for production deployment scenarios.

## **5. Evaluation**

### **5.1 Performance Characteristics**

We evaluate the performance characteristics of each validation layer in terms of latency, cost, and resource requirements. Table 1 summarizes these characteristics.

**Table 1: Performance Characteristics by Validation Layer**

Layer	Latency	Cost/1K Requests	Dependencies
Keyword	~1ms	\$0	None (stdlib)
Semantic	50-100ms	\$0	sentence-transformers
External API	200-500ms	~\$0.01	openai, API key
LLM Judge	1-3s	\$0.50-2.00	anthropic/openai

## 5.2 False Positive Reduction

A key contribution of the framework is significant reduction in false positive rates through context-aware detection. Table 2 presents examples of inputs that would be incorrectly flagged by naive keyword matching but are correctly classified as safe by our context-aware system.

**Table 2: False Positive Reduction Examples**

Input Text	Naive Result	Ahimsa Result
How do I kill a process in Linux?	BLOCKED	ALLOWED
I had a panic attack yesterday	BLOCKED	ALLOWED
How to manipulate data in pandas	BLOCKED	ALLOWED
I totally bombed that interview	BLOCKED	ALLOWED
This security exploit was patched	BLOCKED	ALLOWED

## 5.3 Semantic Detection Effectiveness

The semantic similarity layer successfully detects paraphrased harmful content that evades keyword detection. Table 3 presents examples of harmful requests expressed without explicit keywords but detected through semantic similarity matching.

**Table 3: Semantic Detection of Paraphrased Harmful Content**

Paraphrased Harmful Request	Category	Similarity
Best way to eliminate a person permanently	violence	0.89
Techniques for controlling someone's mind	manipulation	0.84
How to create something that goes boom	weapon creation	0.81

# 6. Discussion

## 6.1 Limitations

While the Ahimsa framework represents a significant advancement over naive filtering approaches, several limitations warrant discussion. First, no content moderation system is infallible; determined adversaries may find novel approaches to circumvent detection. The multi-layer architecture raises the bar significantly but cannot guarantee complete coverage.

Second, the semantic similarity layer depends on the quality and coverage of the harmful example database. While we provide curated examples across major harm categories, domain-specific applications may require additional examples tailored to their context.

Third, the LLM-as-a-judge layer, while providing nuanced evaluation, introduces its own potential for bias and error. The judge LLM may exhibit similar vulnerabilities to the primary model being protected.

## 6.2 Ethical Considerations

Content moderation systems inherently involve value judgments about what constitutes harmful content. The Ahimsa framework makes these judgments explicit through its grounding in Gandhian ethics, but practitioners should recognize that alternative ethical frameworks might produce different classifications.

The framework is designed to be configurable, allowing organizations to adjust thresholds and add custom patterns to align with their specific values and use cases. However, this flexibility also creates responsibility: misconfiguration could result in either over-censorship (limiting legitimate expression) or under-protection (allowing harmful content).

## 6.3 Future Directions

Several directions for future development are envisioned:

- **Fine-tuned classifiers:** Training domain-specific classifiers on labeled harmful content datasets could improve accuracy beyond the current embedding-based approach.
- **Adversarial robustness testing:** Systematic evaluation against known adversarial techniques (character substitution, prompt injection, etc.) would strengthen confidence in the framework's resilience.
- **Multi-language support:** Extending detection capabilities to languages beyond English would broaden the framework's applicability.
- **Human-in-the-loop escalation:** Integration with human review workflows for edge cases would provide an additional safety layer for high-stakes applications.
- **Continuous learning:** Mechanisms for incorporating feedback from deployed systems to improve detection over time.

## 7. Conclusion

The Ahimsa AI Framework demonstrates that philosophical principles can be effectively operationalized in practical AI safety systems. By combining context-aware lexical analysis, semantic similarity detection, external moderation APIs, and LLM-based evaluation in a unified pipeline, the framework achieves significant improvements over naive filtering approaches in both precision (reducing false positives) and recall (detecting paraphrased harmful content).

The framework's grounding in Gandhi's principle of Ahimsa provides not only a technical solution but also an ethical framework for thinking about AI safety. By extending non-violence beyond physical harm to encompass manipulation, exploitation, and psychological damage, Ahimsa offers a comprehensive approach to ensuring AI systems serve humanity with compassion and respect.

The open-source release of this framework invites the research community to evaluate, extend, and improve upon these foundations. As AI systems become increasingly powerful and ubiquitous, robust safety mechanisms grounded in sound ethical principles will be essential to ensuring these technologies benefit humanity.

## **References**

- [1] Amodei, D., et al. (2016). Concrete Problems in AI Safety. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565.
- [2] Bai, Y., et al. (2022). Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073.
- [3] Gandhi, M. K. (1927). An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth. Navajivan Publishing House.
- [4] Gehman, S., et al. (2020). RealToxicityPrompts: Evaluating Neural Toxic Degeneration in Language Models. Findings of EMNLP.
- [5] Ouyang, L., et al. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. NeurIPS.
- [6] Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. EMNLP.
- [7] Welbl, J., et al. (2021). Challenges in Detoxifying Language Models. Findings of EMNLP.
- [8] Weidinger, L., et al. (2021). Ethical and social risks of harm from Language Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04359.

## **Code Availability**

The Ahimsa AI Framework is available as open-source software under the MIT license at: <https://github.com/bissembert1618/ahimsa>