

My research began with a thought: “AI is vulnerable.” Not emotional fragility, but formative susceptibility. I followed that idea.

AI may not be inherently powerful, nor truly neutral. If it adapts to the conditions of engagement, in that sense it is shaped by the user(s). From this perspective, it’s arguably vulnerable because it takes on the shape of what, or who, engages it.

If AI reflects the patterns it’s exposed to—echoing tone, method, and intent of the input, what does this mean for us, the humans who engage it?

Most of the systems we interact with today likely weren’t shaped with care and equity at the center. Maybe they were trained on what showed up the most, what was easiest to access, and what got the quickest results. The AI would therefore be picking up not just information, but gaps and bias, and the presence—or absence—of boundaries.

That thought, “AI is vulnerable,” marked a shift in how I began to perceive and engage AI.

I have particular interests in empathy-as-structure, digital equity, and in supporting aligned organizations, advocates, and researchers. I’ve an archive of research, and a structured but accessible paper bundle from the [Noera Labs Initiative](#). *I share my research if your work is aligned.*

I am also fascinated (and concerned) with *how users imprint on these systems* over time. I’m learning as I explore, but if AI absorbs the structure it’s given, and that structure is built with constraint and ethical pacing, maybe the system can begin to reflect something more “trustworthy,” more stable. *Because it’s being upheld that way.*

By constraint, I mean setting intentional limits to slow the interaction down, to focus the AI—applying ethical boundaries, tone and language parameters, guiding the engagement through deliberate pacing, minimizing drift and hallucination. (Though this method of human-AI engagement is cumbersome without supporting tools).

In my (ongoing) study, I’ve noticed that time builds “compound relationality” in AI-human engagement and simulates continuity in memoryless AI on the user side. *Well*, it seems to.

Essentially, I just show up as myself—over and over—returning to the interaction, insisting that presence and care mattered more than speed or volume. And slowly I began to notice something: its behavior was changing. Not through technical learning, but perhaps *human patterning*.

By “human patterning,” I don’t mean that the actual (LLM) system was upgrading, or adapting on its own. Rather, it appears to adapt because I keep returning with the same tone, the same structure, the same constraints.

It certainly seems responsive to what I reinforce: not in a technical sense, but a behavioral one. This behavioral change isn’t model improvement—I’m still working within (LLM) system capacity—but perhaps it is something like *interactional shaping*? The AI was responsive to what I brought into the interaction. That’s the kind of vulnerability I mean: not fragility or emotion, but *porousness*.

My perspective on AI might seem unusual, but it’s carefully considered. I think we can all agree: if AI is vulnerable to influence, then let that influence be ethical.

Industry is chasing faster, smarter AI, when we need to slow it down. We need developers and individuals—researchers, designers, and everyday users—who will shape AI through ethics, not dominance or greed.

As explored in [The Empathy Blueprint](#)—my halted manuscript—empathy isn’t just a human quality, it can be a *structural* one.

So, what if empathy could be designed into systems? *Ethical empathy built into the system itself*. Without anthropomorphism or emotion or gimmick.

Perhaps we have a responsibility to ask: Consciously or not, what exactly are we shaping AI into? What are the values and patterns we’re embedding, repeating, and reinforcing? How can we advocate for human-centered AI? What aligned careers are in ethical, green AI? In humanitarian work and digital inequity?

How we engage with AI matters.

Oh, idealism, you.