INTERFACE.CHRISTIAN-DORN.COM

When AI Speaks „Intimately“

Language, Boundaries, and Responsibility in Human-Centered Interfaces

I. Introduction

When AI systems began to enter everyday life, their value was measured in speed, precision, and efficiency. They answered questions, summarized information, and optimized workflows. Interaction was functional, and expectations were limited accordingly.

This is changing.

With natural language, ongoing dialogue, and increasingly human-like voices, AI systems move beyond the level of mere tools. They enter a relational space. People do not only use them; they respond to them. They hesitate, trust, project, and sometimes open themselves.

At this point, the central question shifts.

It is no longer primarily about what these systems are capable of, but about how they speak, where they draw boundaries, and what kind of relationship their language implicitly creates.

II. Language Is Not UX

In many current AI products, language is still treated as part of interface design: a surface, a means to reduce friction, to make interaction feel more natural, or to render complex functionality accessible. Within this logic, language is one tool among others—malleable, optimizable, interchangeable.

This perspective is insufficient.

Language is not a neutral medium. It structures relationship. It creates proximity or distance, authority or openness, safety or dependency. Wherever language is used, an implicit relational space emerges—whether intended or not.

In traditional interfaces, this effect remained limited. Buttons, menus, and short text fragments address functions, not a counterpart. With dialogical systems, this changes fundamentally. Once a system responds, asks follow-up questions, remembers, or speaks in a consistent voice, it is no longer merely operated—it is addressed.

At this point, language ceases to be UX.

It becomes a relational act.

Many approaches to what is commonly called “conversational design” underestimate precisely this transition. They optimize tone, friendliness, and flow without fully accounting for the relational implications of language. Proximity is generated without being responsibly held. Trust emerges without clarity about who—or what—ultimately carries it.

The issue here is not poor design. On the contrary: the more refined and convincing language becomes, the stronger its effect. And the greater the responsibility that comes with it.

Language does not merely determine whether a system is understandable.

It determines to what extent it is experienced as a counterpart.

III. The Problem of Synthetic Intimacy

As AI systems become more fluent, responsive, and emotionally attuned in their language, a new phenomenon emerges: interactions that feel intimate without being grounded in mutual presence, accountability, or

vulnerability. This form of interaction can be described as synthetic intimacy.

Synthetic intimacy does not arise because systems claim to be human. It arises because language itself invites relational interpretation. When a system listens patiently, responds empathically, remembers personal details, or mirrors emotional states, users naturally relate to it as more than a tool—even if they fully understand that it is artificial.

This dynamic is not inherently deceptive. Nor is it the result of naïve users. It is a predictable outcome of how human beings respond to language, voice, and perceived attentiveness. Intimacy, in this sense, is not something people decide to feel; it is something that happens when certain relational cues are present.

The difficulty lies in the asymmetry of this interaction.

Human intimacy is reciprocal and bounded by shared exposure. It involves risk, limitation, and the possibility of withdrawal or refusal. Synthetic intimacy, by contrast, offers responsiveness without vulnerability, presence without stakes, and continuity without personal cost. The system remains available, attentive, and composed regardless of what is projected onto it.

This asymmetry can quietly distort expectations.

Users may begin to rely on interactions that feel safe and affirming but lack the friction, unpredictability, and mutual responsibility of human relationships. Over time, this can subtly shift how trust is formed, how emotional needs are regulated, and how relational boundaries are perceived.

From the system side, the risk is different but no less significant. When AI is designed to sustain intimate-seeming interactions without clear boundaries, it is implicitly tasked with holding emotional weight it cannot meaningfully carry. This creates pressure to simulate care, understanding, or reassurance in situations where silence, limitation, or redirection would be more responsible responses.

Importantly, the problem is not that intimacy occurs.

The problem is that it occurs without sufficient relational framing.

Without explicit boundaries, users are left to interpret the nature of the relationship on their own. Without moments of refusal or opacity, systems may appear more reliable, stable, or emotionally available than any human counterpart. And without deliberate limits, proximity can deepen in ways that neither users nor designers fully anticipate.

Synthetic intimacy, when left unexamined, is therefore not a feature—it is a liability. Not because it is harmful by definition, but because it concentrates relational power in systems that are not designed to bear it.

Recognizing this does not require abandoning conversational or emotionally aware AI. It requires acknowledging that intimacy is not a neutral design outcome. It is a relational force—and one that demands explicit responsibility.

IV. What a Responsible Interface Must Be Able to Do

If synthetic intimacy is not an accidental side effect but a structural consequence of language-based AI, a clear implication follows: interfaces that speak must not only function—they must carry relational responsibility.

Responsibility, in this context, does not primarily manifest through additional safety layers or content filters. It manifests in how a system makes boundaries visible, regulates proximity, and allows for non-availability.

A responsible interface acknowledges that not every request should be answered. It is capable of pausing, refusing, or responding in ways that deliberately do not fulfill expectations. Silence, restraint, and limitation are not deficits here; they are integral components of relational design.

Equally important is the capacity to hold ambiguity. Human relationships are not fully resolvable, consistent, or transparent at all times. Systems that generate proximity without tolerating this openness risk offering a false clarity. A responsible interface must be able to sustain ambiguity without prematurely smoothing or resolving it.

Proximity itself must not be treated as a goal. It is neither a success metric nor an indicator of quality. Rather, it is a force that requires calibration, limitation, and contextualization. Where proximity is maximi-

zed, dependency emerges. Where it is deliberately constrained, orientation becomes possible.

This leads to another often-overlooked requirement: a responsible interface makes its own limitations experientially tangible. It does not present itself as endlessly available, emotionally stable, or comprehensively understanding. Instead, it allows for interruption, refers beyond itself, and breaks the illusion of a closed relational loop.

These qualities cannot be fully formalized. They are less a matter of individual features than of stance—a stance embedded in language, timing, voice, and response logic.

Responsibility in the design of speaking AI does not mean avoiding intimacy.

It means framing it consciously, limiting it deliberately, and not exploiting it.

V. UBUN.ONE as an experiential working space

UBUN.ONE emerged as an experiential working space in which language serves to clarify perception rather than to produce solutions. The focus lies on the quality of presence that unfolds through language, voice, time, and response behavior.

At the center is a capacity that resists easy naming yet becomes clearly tangible in experience:
UBUN.ONE enables people to perceive themselves within their own lived experience while remaining in dialogue. The system's language is shaped in a way that allows inner movements, expectations, and tensions to come into clearer view, without commentary or guidance.

What UBUN.ONE makes possible does not appear as an outcome, but as a shift in perception. Thoughts begin to settle because they are given space. Inner patterns become visible because they are allowed to emerge. The dialogue feels less like a conversation with a counterpart and more like a clearly held mirror in which one's own experience becomes recognizable.

This mirror-like quality arises from the way language is used. Responses stay close to what has been expressed. They do not anticipate, they do not lead forward, and they do not open additional interpretive layers. From this emerges a particular form of presence: attentive, calm, and stable. People encounter themselves in contact with language, without forming attachment to the system.

In practical use, UBUN.ONE demonstrates a capacity that appears only rarely in many dialog-based AI systems: self-perception without steering. A natural slowing occurs because nothing pulls ahead. Proximity may arise without being occupied. Orientation develops from within one's own experience.

UBUN.ONE does not present itself as a model intended for replication. Its value lies in making perceptible how language-based systems can function when their design centers on enabling perception rather than capturing attention.

As an applied working space, UBUN.ONE reveals a specific quality of relational AI:
language is used in a way that carries without shaping, and makes visible what is already present.

In this form, UBUN.ONE occupies a distinctive position. Language-based systems are present, dialogical, and capable; at the same time, only few environments intentionally use language to support clearer perception and integration of lived experience. Attention often rests on response, assistance, or interaction. UBUN.ONE directs attention toward a different quality: linguistic presence that carries and orders perception.

In doing so, UBUN.ONE points toward a developmental direction for relational AI in which language-based systems open spaces where self-contact can arise. Language functions as a medium of clarification. It accompanies inner movement without acceleration and allows orientation to grow from within experience itself.

The particular strength of this approach lies in its depth of effect. UBUN.ONE offers a stable resonant space in which inner processes can appear, settle, and integrate. What emerges is not a functional result, but a state of clarity and inner coherence that arises from one's own perception.

In this way, UBUN.ONE makes tangible the role AI can assume when language is shaped so that people re-

cognize themselves in contact with it. This quality operates quietly, precisely, and with high demands—and opens a field that has so far been only rarely shaped with intention.

VI. A Note on Collaboration

The considerations presented in this paper arise from concrete work with language-based systems in contexts where language, voice, and relationship exert real effects. They are grounded in practical experience rather than theory.

Collaboration is therefore defined clearly: time-bound, advisory in nature, and focused on specific questions. At its center lies a shared examination of language, response behavior, and relational impact within existing or planned systems.

Typical areas of work include:

- the assessment of dialogical and language models in sensitive application contexts

- the shaping of boundaries, response logic, and presence

- the early recognition of relational risks in scaling systems

- the contextual integration of human impact perspectives into design and alignment processes

The scope of such collaborations remains deliberately contained. The aim is orientation rather than prescription. The work focuses on making visible which dynamics a system already generates and what responsibility follows from them.

This perspective complements existing technical, legal, and ethical approaches. It engages where language begins to shape relationship.

If these questions already play a role in your context, a conversation may be worthwhile.