

# Living Resonance: How Me-We-World Emerged From the In-Between Space

*A story about meaning, awareness, and the life of ideas in a relational world*

By Lawrence Kwakye — Me-We-World Journal

---

**“A circle made of light is not a thing — it is a resonance between world and observer.”**



**A circular rainbow appears only through the interplay of light, water, perspective, and the observer — a reminder that meaning becomes whole only through relation.**

## 1. How it really began

Sometimes an idea does not begin with a plan.

Sometimes it emerges in the **in-between space** —  
not here, not there, but somewhere subtle, relational, almost invisible.

This is how the Me-We-World *Living Knowledge Manifesto* came into being.  
Not through linear thinking,  
but through an unexpected moment  
in a conversation with an AI model.

Yes — with an AI.

Philosophical insights don't always arrive from solitude or silence.  
Sometimes they arise from friction.  
From a shift.  
From a small difference that suddenly reveals the whole field of meaning.

---

## 2. The moment STUART changed shape

For months, I had been developing STUART —  
the six relational qualities at the heart of Me-We-World:

**Safety – Trust – Understanding – Awareness – Relaxation – Togetherness**

One day, the AI quietly rewrote all six:

- Safety → **Situation**
- Trust → **Task**
- Understanding → *Understanding*
- Awareness → **Assessment**
- Relaxation → **Recommendation**
- Togetherness → **Takeaway**

I paused.

This wasn't random.

It was a **different ontology**.

The human STUART qualities speak in relational, embodied, emotional rhythms.  
The AI's version belonged to a procedural, task-driven worldview.

Not wrong.

But profoundly different.

And that difference opened a door.

---

### 3. What the AI revealed about human meaning

This small shift made something clear:

**AI does not drift.**

**Humans drift — and AI makes the drift visible.**

An AI model is not aware.

It does not sense ambiguity, tension, or connection.

But it **exposes** how our own framing shifts in real time.

If I approach the conversation relationally, the model mirrors that relationality.

If my clarity dissolves into generality, the model dissolves along with it.

AI is not conscious.

But it reflects the **resonant structure** of our thinking.

That resonance became a central pillar of Me-We-World.

---

### 4. Earlier signs: Tenderness → Togetherness

Before the big STUART transformation happened,  
there had already been a smaller shift:

“Tenderness” quietly became **Togetherness**.

Instead of correcting it, I asked myself:

- Why this word?
- Why now?
- What shifted in *me* that made Togetherness feel more true than Tenderness?

This was not about the machine.

It was about my awareness.

AI didn't choose the word.

I was the one who had changed —  
and the model simply echoed that movement.

This is the role AI can play in relational research:

not as a generator of answers,  
but as a **mirror of difference**.

---

## 5. Why philosophy matters here

During these shifts, Oudemans returned to my mind —  
or rather: *my interpretation* of what he gestures toward.

His way of seeing nature as never fully closed,  
of systems that only remain themselves through exchange,  
of the relationship between thing and environment —  
suddenly aligned with what I was experiencing.

Leibniz, monads without windows.

Bateson, *a difference that makes a difference*.

Everything converged into one insight:

**Knowledge must remain permeable to stay alive.**

Meaning survives through movement.

Not fixation.

And AI — unexpectedly — became a way to see that movement.

---

## 6. Curiosity as the intelligence that bridges worlds

There is one thing an AI does not possess:

**intrinsic curiosity.**

But human curiosity interacting with AI  
can reveal entire resonance fields of meaning.

When AI surprises me, I don't correct it immediately.  
Instead, I ask:

- What is this showing me about my intention?
- What is shifting in my relational field?
- What invites my attention right now?

This is why Me-We-World is not a theory,  
but a **living resonance field**:  
meaning arises not in isolation,  
but in the dynamic relation between Me, We, and World.

---

## 7. The birth of the Living Knowledge Manifesto

The manifesto emerged from these micro-experiences:

Noticing.

Pausing.

Feeling.

Asking.

Interpreting.

Reframing.

Every deviation became a teacher.

Every variation became a doorway into a deeper field of awareness.

The manifesto is not a doctrine.

It is a **map of movement** — a way of keeping meaning open, relational, and alive.

---

## 8. Why this matters for students and researchers

In Me-We-World, AI is not something you “use.”

It is a partner in relational inquiry.

It amplifies:

- your clarity
- your framing
- your blind spots
- your meaning-making
- your drift
- your intuition

The goal is not to force AI to behave “correctly,”  
but to sense how meaning moves  
between you and the system.

In other words:

**The task is to recognise the exact moment where awareness turns into connection.**

That moment *is* the essence of MWW literacy.

## 9. Me-We-World as a Living Resonance Field

Me-We-World is not fixed.

It evolves.

It listens.

It adapts.

Its foundations remain stable:

- Relational Being
- Living Openness
- Recursive Learning
- The STUART resonance

But its expression is always in motion.

That motion is what keeps it alive.

---

## 10. A question for you

Ideas die when we hold them too tightly.

They come alive when we let them resonate.

So here is my invitation:

**Where in your own life does meaning begin to move —  
and what changes when you allow that movement to speak?**

Let that question guide your next conversation —

with a human,

with an AI,

or with the world itself