



IMAGE: ESMA MELIKE SEZER/ UNSPLASH

Staying human in the age of AI

NADIA JAHAN

Nadia Jahan is a development communications professional based out of Dhaka.



AI has slipped into daily life with a kind of stealth. One moment you are using it to tidy up an email or translate a paragraph, and the next you are letting it outline your presentation, draft your report, suggest your next move, even tell you what you feel. The shift is not just about new software. It is about habits. In a country where young people are under relentless pressure to compete, save time and sound polished, the temptation is obvious: delegate as much as possible, move faster than everyone else, and let the machine take the strain.

But there is a cost to handing over too much. The more we outsource, the more we risk hollowing out the very qualities that make us employable, resilient, and alive to one another. Staying human in the age of AI means knowing when to use the tool and when to step back from it, not out of nostalgia, but because some parts of life only work when we do them ourselves.

AI tools can be wrong, inconsistent, or strangely generic. They can flatten nuance, misunderstand context, and reproduce patterns that are common rather than correct.

There is an easy misunderstanding about AI that makes over-delegation feel harmless. We treat it like a calculator for words, a neutral device that simply speeds up what we already know. Yet many AI systems do more than compute. They generate. They suggest. They complete our thoughts for us, often in a tone that sounds confident and coherent. That can create the illusion of competence even when the underlying thinking is thin. If we accept that illusion too often, we begin to live in a world where sounding right matters more than being right, and where the first draft becomes the

final one.

The first thing we lose is the muscle of judgement. Writing a message, shaping an argument, or making a decision is not only about producing an output. It is about weighing what matters, anticipating how it will land, and taking responsibility for the consequences. When you let AI do the heavy lifting every time, you may still get something workable on the page, but you gradually weaken the inner sense that tells you what is true, what is fair, what is missing, and what does not sound like you. That sense is slow to build and easy to erode.

There is also a practical risk: dependency makes people fragile. AI tools can be wrong, inconsistent, or strangely generic. They can flatten nuance, misunderstand context, and reproduce patterns that are common rather than correct. If you have not practised doing the work yourself, you cannot reliably catch the errors. You also struggle when the stakes rise: when a client challenges a claim, when an interviewer asks you to explain your reasoning, when you have to negotiate, persuade, or improvise in real time. In those moments, there is no prompt that can replace a well-trained mind.

The second thing we lose is originality. Not in the grand sense of artistic genius, but in the everyday sense that your work carries a trace of your experience: your curiosity, your humour, your way of seeing. AI can imitate styles and remix familiar patterns, which is exactly why it can be useful for routine tasks. But if you let it write everything, you end up speaking in borrowed rhythms. You become less memorable. You become easier to replace.

This is where the so-called “human touch” becomes more than a sentimental phrase. In competitive workplaces and crowded markets, the human touch is often the differentiator.

SEE PAGE 39



IMAGE: GINGERANN/ UNSPLASH