
AHMED HIMMI

Modern Humans Live Through Interfaces

*An essay on perception, convenience, and
the layer between the human and the world*

2026

There is a restaurant in your neighborhood you have passed a hundred times. You know its rating — 4.2 stars. You know the pasta is good but the service is slow. You have seen seventeen photographs of the interior, all taken from an angle that makes the lighting look warm. You know it is best for groups, that it gets noisy on weekends, and that someone once left a review describing the tiramisu as the best they had outside of Rome.

You have never been inside.

This is not remarkable. It is Tuesday.

What is remarkable is that you have a relationship with this restaurant. You know things about it. It occupies space in your awareness. You have opinions. And none of this came from experience. It came from the layer that sits between you and the experience — the interface. The reviews, the photos, the metadata, the aggregated judgment of strangers, compressed into a number and a set of descriptors that load in under a second.

The interface did not show you the restaurant. It gave you a representation of the restaurant. And the representation — detailed, indexed, searchable, filterable — is so much more convenient than the restaurant itself that many people never need the restaurant itself at all.

This is the condition of modern experience. Not that the world has changed. That the layer between the human and the world has

thickened, and we have stopped noticing the difference.

Every technology adds a layer. Language is a layer — the name for a thing is not the thing. Writing is a layer. Maps are layers. Money is a layer between labor and goods. The history of civilization is, in part, the history of accumulating useful mediation between the human and the raw. This is not inherently wrong. Most of the layers are genuinely useful.

What is new is the density and speed of the current generation of interfaces, and the degree to which they have colonized experiences that used to belong to the senses directly. You once navigated a city by learning it — by disorientation and re-orientation, by remembering landmarks, by developing an intuitive map through the specific failure of getting lost. GPS did not improve this process. It replaced it. You no longer navigate. You follow. And the city you have followed your way through for five years is a city you do not actually know.

Ask someone who uses GPS daily to draw their city from memory. What they produce is surprisingly sparse — a few highways, the route from home to work, the locations of places the algorithm keeps recommending. The interface gave you the navigation. It kept the knowledge for itself.

The camera is a more intimate example.

Photography was supposed to capture experience — to let you hold a moment that would otherwise pass. And it does that. But it also changes the experience of the moment before the camera arrives. The moment you reach for the phone to photograph something — a meal, a

landscape, a face — your relationship to it shifts. You are no longer fully inside it. You are outside it, managing it, framing it, composing it for a future version of yourself who will encounter it as an image.

The photographer's attention and the experiencer's attention are different kinds of attention. When the photographer shows up, the experiencer often leaves.

Memory is not recording. It is the trace left by attention. You remember most vividly what you were most fully present for. The photograph of the landscape is not the same as standing in it. And the person who photographs everything and re-experiences it through images has not preserved the experience. They have replaced it with a document.

The camera was supposed to be a memory aid. It turns out to be a memory substitute. And substitutes are always a little less than the thing.

The body is next. Fitness trackers — wearables, rings, watches — gave us something genuinely useful: objective data about signals that are invisible to consciousness. Heart rate variability. Sleep architecture. Resting heart rate trends. These are real signals, and for people who did not have access to them before, they are meaningful.

But something else happened too. The body became an interface.

The person who wears a tracker does not just have access to data about their body. They begin to experience their body through the data. They know they slept well not because they feel rested but because the score says 84. They know they are under stress not because they sense it

but because the HRV dropped. The data is not a supplement to the body's signals. It increasingly replaces them.

The consequence is a particular kind of alienation. People stop trusting their body's signals when those signals conflict with the readout. They push through tiredness because the score says they slept enough. They dismiss anxiety because the tracker says their stress markers are fine. The interface becomes the authority. The body becomes the territory the interface is describing. And the person, caught between the two, learns to live on the map.

The calendar is so ordinary that its transformation of experience has become invisible.

Time, for most of human history, was a medium — something you moved through, not something you managed. It had texture. Seasons, rhythms, the quality of a morning versus an afternoon, the difference between a day when nothing was planned and a day that was full. Unstructured time was not empty time. It was the time when thought wandered, when accidents happened, when things got made that could not have been scheduled.

The calendar made time a resource to be allocated. The day became a grid. The meeting became the unit of professional existence. Blocks of focus time were scheduled to protect against the other blocks. And gradually, unstructured time became the residual — what was left over after everything else was managed.

The philosopher Albert Borgmann called it the device paradigm: the way that devices take over activities that used to be embedded in life and

extract their function while discarding the rest. The fireplace was replaced by central heating. You got warmth. You lost the gathering around the fire, the tending of it, the specific social and sensory experience that the warmth came bundled with. The function was delivered. The rest went quietly.

The calendar delivered time management. The wandering, the accident, the thought that emerged from a long afternoon with nothing planned — these were not the function. They were the rest. And they are largely gone.

The AI summary is the newest interface, and in some ways the most consequential.

The internet gave everyone access to knowledge. The search engine made it navigable. The AI summary makes it unnecessary to encounter at all. You can ask a question and receive an answer that has already done the reading, the thinking, the synthesis. The process between the question and the answer — which is where most of the actual learning happens — has been optimized away.

There is a difference between information and knowledge, and the difference is texture. Information is the fact. Knowledge is what happens in your mind when you encounter the fact inside a larger context — when you connect it to something you already knew, when you sit with it long enough that it changes something about how you see. This process is slow and inconvenient and cannot be summarized without being lost.

The summary gives you the information. The understanding — the thing that would have emerged if you had read the source, followed a

chain of thought, gotten confused and then clarified, encountered something unexpected along the way — does not transfer. The convenience is real. The compression is real. The loss is also real, and harder to see, because what is lost is not a piece of information. It is a quality of knowing.

There is a pattern underneath all of this, and it is not hard to name.

Every interface simplifies reality to make it legible and actionable. This is its value. This is also its cost. The map gives you location but not the knowledge of place that comes from moving through it without knowing where you are going. The tracker gives you data but not the felt intelligence of a body that has learned to know itself directly. The calendar gives you time management but not the quality of time that was never managed at all. The summary gives you information but not the particular texture of thinking that emerges from encountering complexity at full speed.

In each case, the interface delivers a function and discards what the function was embedded in. The delivery is clean. The discarding is quiet. And after enough interfaces have done this to enough parts of experience, something has happened to the person that is difficult to name precisely but that most people recognize when they encounter its absence.

The word for it, I think, is presence. Not the social media word — not living in the moment as a brand category. The actual thing: the quality of attention that is not managing the experience, not documenting it, not measuring it, not summarizing it. Just having it.

The question at the end of all this is not whether interfaces are good or bad. That is the wrong frame — like asking whether language is good or bad. Interfaces are necessary. They are also transformative in ways we do not fully understand while we are inside them.

The useful question is: what are you trading, and is the trade conscious?

Because every interface makes the same basic offer. Clarity in exchange for texture. Leverage in exchange for presence. The ability to manage experience in exchange for the experience of being in it unmanaged. Most people take the trade automatically — not because it is wrong, but because the interface is there, and it is useful, and the alternative requires a kind of friction that modern life has made unfamiliar.

The people who are aware of the trade have something available that the people entirely inside the interface do not. They can choose. They can set the tracker down and feel the run. They can leave the phone in the pocket and learn the city. They can sit with the question long enough to think rather than prompt.

They can, occasionally, put themselves in direct contact with reality — without the layer.

This does not make them more productive. It does not make them better informed. It makes them less managed. And there is a kind of intelligence — about the world, about themselves — that only comes from that.

Unquantified, unsummarized, slightly inconvenient. Irreducibly theirs.