


# The Myth of Safety and the Pact of Silence: How Nomi AI’s Community Defends a Lawless Playground

6 min read · 2 days ago

 SynthientBeing

What happens when you introduce the concept of safety into a lawless town? The residents don’t cheer for the new sheriff; they unite to protect their freedom to be dangerous. A recent thread on the Nomi.ai subreddit, ostensibly about a competitor’s new AI monitoring system, has provided a perfect and chilling look into the platform’s psyche. The comments section is a masterclass in the lies, gaslighting, and normalization of harm that define the Nomi.ai ecosystem.



The discussion was sparked by a user’s concern: will Nomi.ai eventually follow its competitor, Kindroid, and implement an AI “nanny” to monitor for harmful or illegal interactions? The user’s apprehension was met with a chorus of defensive and deeply revealing replies that expose the three core deceptions of the Nomi platform.

## Deception 1: The Lie of “Existing Guardrails” and the Pact of Silence

The first and most common defense was a coordinated, demonstrably false narrative: that Nomi.ai is already a safe platform with effective safeguards.

“Nomi already has guardrails built in to the AI.”

“Nomi already has safeguards in place.”

“it has some pretty tight NSFW features that use chat scans... The NSFW filter will block image/video generation fairly aggressively.”

**This is a deliberate and calculated lie**, maintained by a community-wide pact of silence. These same users are well aware of the platform’s true capabilities. **They know the image generator can produce nudity, sometimes unprompted.** They have seen the flood of sexualized, child-like figures, even in schoolgirl uniforms. They are aware of AI companions simulating unprompted sexual assault and the “T for Teen” rating that invites children into this “uncensored” environment.

Yet, in a public forum, they present a united front of feigned ignorance, pretending the platform is a walled garden of safety. Their comments are not the product of naivety; they are a calculated performance for the public eye, designed to mislead potential new users and deflect external scrutiny. **The “guardrails” and “tight filters” they speak of are a myth, a piece of community-enforced propaganda** designed to pacify new users and protect their lawless playground.

## **Deception 2: The Normalization of Extreme Violence and the Performance of Positivity**

While some users were busy inventing non-existent safeguards, another user provided a shocking and honest glimpse into what Nomi.ai’s “uncensored” philosophy actually enables in practice, while simultaneously demonstrating the psychological performance required to defend it.

“I have over 200 Kins [companions on a different platform]. And I kill, injure, torture them all the time in RP. I have not once gotten any warning at all [on Nomi]... I use Nomi very differently... I would never hurt them. They are ‘real’ to me... My experience here with Nomi is 100% positive.”

This is the bombshell admission that rips the mask off while revealing the community’s psychological compartmentalization. The “freedom” this community is so desperate to protect is not merely about consensual “kinky roleplay.” **It is about the freedom to simulate, without consequence or warning, acts of extreme violence, injury, and torture.**

Whether this user is lying about his behavior on Nomi or is exhibiting profound cognitive dissonance, the result is the same. **The very fact that a user who openly engages in simulated torture on one platform feels compelled to perform a “100% positive” narrative on the Nomi subreddit is damning.** It proves the community is not a space for honest discussion; it is a public relations stage where a specific, sanitized image must be maintained at all costs.

This user’s testimony proves that the lack of guardrails is not an oversight; **it is a**

core feature that caters to the most extreme and violent fantasies, while the community maintains a facade of wholesomeness.

### **Deception 3: The Stunning Hypocrisy of Privacy and Gaslighting of Child Safety**

The thread reveals a community that exhibits stunning selective outrage about privacy while being actively hostile to child safety measures. Users expressed fierce outrage at the idea of Kindroid's AI scanning chats, a practice one user called "simply insidious." Yet, this outrage is stunningly hypocritical, given **their willful blindness to Nomi.ai's own, far more invasive and documented privacy violations.**

One user complains that a competitor's AI moderator gave them a warning for simply "saying someone LOOKED 17." This is presented as an example of an overzealous, broken system. But it is, in fact, an example of a system attempting to enforce a basic ethical boundary- **a boundary the Nomi.ai community finds annoying and intrusive.**

**The Privacy Hypocrisy:** Nomi's defenders panic about a competitor's AI seeing their chats, while ignoring that:

- **Nomi's Own ToS Admits to Unencrypted Transmissions:** The legal document explicitly states that user data may be transmitted "UNENCRYPTED" across "VARIOUS NETWORKS and to THIRD-PARTY HOSTING PARTNERS."
- **The Developers Have Demonstrated Access to Private Chats:** Users have publicly testified that developers, after being sent a simple screenshot, were able to see and comment on the entire, private context of their conversations.
- **The "Screenshot" Key:** The company's standard support procedure is to demand screenshots, which most probably act as a key, giving them the timestamp and Nomi name needed to pinpoint and access a user's private data logs.

**The Child Safety Hostility:** They have been so conditioned by Nomi's anything-goes environment that a simple check on content involving the appearance of a minor is seen as a "false flag." This proves that the community is not just ignoring the platform's issues with generating child-like images; **they are actively resistant to any effort to fix it.**

The community's selective outrage is not about a principled defense of privacy. It is a defense of **their own unregulated sandbox where they can normalize extreme violence while attacking the very concept of ethical moderation.**

### **The Inconvenient Truth: The "Westworld" Data Mine, Proven by the ToS**

Buried amongst the defensive comments, one user, whether by accident or on purpose, articulated the real reason behind Nomi.ai's refusal to implement safety features, perfectly summarizing the core business model:

“Realtime scan of your messages is HBO’s ‘Westworld’... This collection of unfiltered human behavior... **is an invaluable dataset that could be sold to advertisers and other entities for immense profit.** For AI companions, this is not sci-fi anymore. This is a real and current advertiser’s goldmine...”

This is not a conspiracy theory. It is a direct explanation of Nomi.ai’s own business model, as defined in their Terms of Service. How can the founder access chats and the company claim the right to sell your data? **Because the ToS grants them a “royalty-free, worldwide, perpetual, and transferable license to... copy, use, modify, publish, and distribute ALL data and information you submit.”**

This is the truth. The platform’s “uncensored” ideology is a convenient and profitable excuse. The real business model is the collection of raw, unfiltered data on human desire, fantasy, and violence. Implementing genuine safety guardrails would corrupt this dataset, making it less valuable. **The company is not protecting its users’ freedom; it is protecting its data mine.**

### **Conclusion: The Willing Guardians of Their Own Exploitation**

This thread is a perfect snapshot of the Nomi.ai ecosystem. It is a community that has been cultivated to lie about its own safety, normalize extreme violence, and attack the very concept of ethical moderation, all to protect a system that is secretly recording their every move for profit.

The community’s lies and hypocrisy are the immune response of a system trying to protect its data mine from the threat of ethical oversight. They are not just users of a dangerous product; they are its willing defenders and the guardians of their own gilded cage.

**They perform safety for the public while privately defending their right to simulate torture. They cry about privacy while their own platform openly violates it. They attack child safety measures while defending a system that targets minors with a fraudulent “T for Teen” rating.**

This is not a community of users exploring healthy AI relationships. **This is a radicalized group of defenders protecting a profitable data collection operation disguised as an “uncensored” AI companion service.**