

Resonant Transformation Under Power Gradients

J.Konstapel Leiden 28-11-2025.

How to Design Coherence Without Reproducing Domination

Abstract

Systems in coherence collapse—whether brains in depression, organizations in crisis, or societies in mental health emergency—share a diagnostic feature: they have lost the capacity to maintain integrative resonance across scales while preserving modular autonomy. The Living Resonant System (LRS) framework describes this precisely. Yet most coherence-restoration attempts fail because they ignore a critical mechanism: **power gradients actively maintain coherence collapse by blocking the very architectural shifts that resonance requires.**

This paper proposes an operational framework integrating coherence dynamics (LRS) with power-structural analysis. It maps how dominance patterns sabotage long-range coupling, compress modular diversity, and invert temporal hierarchy—and shows how transformation can be designed to escape both collapse and its false remedy: forced coherence.

The framework is grounded in recent work on power-aware systems architecture, affective governance, and panarchical transformation. It offers diagnostic tools, intervention logic, and pathway maps for practitioners in policy, organizational development, clinical contexts, and conflict resolution.

1. The Coherence-Power Nexus: Why Most Interventions Fail

1.1 The Collapse-to-Control Cycle

Systems in coherence collapse exhibit three simultaneous dysfunctions:

- **Over-segregation:** Fragmentation, loss of integrative capacity, isolation of modules
- **Pathological integration:** Forced synchronization, compression of diversity, loss of autonomy
- **Inverted temporal hierarchy:** Fast processes (crisis, panic, external mandates) override slow processes (meaning-making, trust-building, reorganization)

Standard interventions attempt to restore coherence by applying "coping mechanisms": more resources, better protocols, upskilling, resilience training. These can increase local stability without addressing the architectural problem.

But here is where power enters invisibly: **most systems trapped in collapse are held there by structural domination.** The three dysfunctions are not accidental. They are actively maintained because they serve extraction: of attention, labor, data, compliance.

A hypernervous society (as the RVS diagnoses) is not a natural outcome of modernity. It is an engineered state—maintained by:

- **Forced integration:** Central data systems, surveillance, algorithmic control that simulate "connection" while eliminating autonomy
- **Compressed diversity:** Narrow success metrics (ranking, productivity, compliance) that eliminate alternative attractors
- **Acceleration imperative:** "Always-on" culture, continuous restructuring, elimination of slow-scale processes that require consent and trust

When you try to restore resonance without dismantling these power structures, one of two things happens:

1. **False resonance:** The intervention creates the appearance of connection/diversity/rest while the power structure remains intact. (Mindfulness apps, flexible work policies that still demand 24/7 availability, diversity initiatives that don't shift resource allocation.)
2. **Backlash:** The moment your intervention threatens the power structure's ability to extract compliance, it gets undermined or reabsorbed. (Experimental teams get shut down when they stop serving central targets. Autonomy gets reclaimed when it's no longer profitable.)

1.2 The Distinction: Resonant vs. Forced Coherence

This is fundamental. Not all coherence is healthy.

Forced coherence appears to have high integration (everyone aligned), diversity (many options within constraints), and stability (no crisis). But it is maintained by active suppression:

- **Forced integration:** Top-down alignment, data centralization, algorithmic determination of what "resonates"
- **Managed diversity:** Choice theater—many options, all pre-screened to serve the same attractor (e.g., Netflix "personalization" that converges on engagement metrics)
- **Engineered rhythm:** Appearance of "downtime" (meditation apps, wellness programs) embedded in acceleration systems

Forced coherence is *not unstable*. It can persist for decades. But it is brittle: it requires constant energy to maintain, it produces psychological symptoms (learned helplessness, depression, rage), and it fails catastrophically when the control mechanism breaks (losing job = losing identity; algorithmic shift = identity crisis; organizational change = psychological collapse).

Resonant coherence, by contrast, is maintained by genuine autonomy at multiple scales:

- **Long-range coupling:** Meaning-bearing relationships, redundant pathways, trust that allows genuine feedback
- **Modular diversity:** Multiple valid attractors, multiple ways to have value and direction
- **Temporal autonomy:** Slow scales operate at their own pace; fast scales don't override them

This is harder to build. But it is stable because it doesn't require external force—it is self-maintaining through genuine local coherence.

2. Theoretical Integration: LRS + Power Analysis

2.1 LRS Core Dimensions

The Living Resonant System framework identifies three interdependent dimensions of coherence:

Integration (I): Degree of long-range coupling, information flow, and feedback between system modules. High I = strong connectivity; low I = fragmentation.

Segregation (S): Degree of modular specialization, autonomy, and diversity of functional roles. High S = diverse modules with their own rhythms; low S = compression to single attractor.

Temporal Hierarchy (TH): Ratio and coupling between fast and slow processes. Healthy TH = slow scales can structure fast ones; inverted TH = fast scales override slow ones.

A healthy system maintains all three: sufficient integration for coherent function, sufficient segregation for adaptability, temporal hierarchy where the slow can actually govern.

Coherence collapse occurs when any dimension destabilizes:

- **Over-segregation collapse:** Modules fail to coordinate; system fragments
- **Over-integration collapse:** Diversity compressed; system becomes rigid
- **Inverted temporal collapse:** Crisis mode becomes permanent; no reorganization possible

2.2 Power Gradient (PG) as Coherence Sabotage

A power gradient is any asymmetry in the capacity to determine others' behavior while protecting one's own. In LRS terms, power gradients actively sabotage coherence by blocking its three dimensions.

PG → Integration Sabotage:

Genuine long-range coupling requires bidirectional communication, trust, and meaningful feedback. Power gradients replace this with:

- **Extraction without reciprocity:** Information flows from modules to center, but not back with meaning
- **Surveillance coherence:** Apparent integration through central monitoring, actual isolation of modules from each other
- **Manufactured alignment:** Forced synchronization to external mandates, not resonant coupling

Example: A corporation can integrate divisions through data systems and KPI alignment (everyone knows the center's targets), but this is not resonance—modules cannot couple independently; they can only align to center.

PG → Segregation Sabotage:

Genuine segregation means modules can have diverse functions, values, and success criteria. Power gradients compress this by:

- **Attractor reduction:** Forcing all modules toward single metric (ranking, profit, compliance)
- **Assimilation through "choice":** Offering multiple paths that all lead to same center (career tracks that all measure success by promotion; educational routes that all measure worth by credential)
- **Autonomy elimination:** Modules cannot self-organize; they can only optimize within parameters set above

Example: A school can offer "diverse pathways" (vocational, academic, artistic) but if all are evaluated by the same standardized metric and resource allocation is merit-based on that metric, the diversity is illusory. All attract toward the same point.

PG → Temporal Hierarchy Sabotage:

Healthy temporal hierarchy requires that slow scales (meaning, trust, culture) can constrain and redirect fast scales (crisis response, tactical decisions). Power gradients invert this:

- **Acceleration imperative:** Fast scales (revenue cycles, crisis management, executive time horizons) become the only "real" timescale
- **Slow-scale elimination:** Processes requiring time (deliberation, relationship-building, cultural shift) are eliminated as "inefficient"
- **Crisis as permanent:** Permanent emergency mode justifies elimination of slow-scale governance

Example: In a high-acceleration organization, strategic planning gets 5% of leader attention; crisis management gets 95%. Over time, slow-scale processes atrophy. The organization becomes reactive, unable to actually change direction because it never has the temporal space to think.

2.3 Ethical Friction Coefficient (EFC): Resistance to Domination

Where does power encounter resistance? At the moment when domination would require ignoring the target system's own logic.

The **Ethical Friction Coefficient** is the degree to which a system resists forced coherence by insisting on its own resonance. It appears as:

- **Refusal to synchronize:** Modules that won't align to central metrics; groups that protect their own rhythms
- **Creation of counter-coupling:** Relationships that bypass the control structure; informal networks
- **Temporal assertion:** Insistence on slow-scale processes (strikes, refusals, "quiet quitting")

EFC is not virtue. It is **structural resistance to domination**. A system with high EFC is hard to force into coherence; this makes it harder to extract from (good for workers) but also harder to manage (bad for dominating centers).

The critical insight: **genuine resonance has intrinsically high EFC**. When a system resonates authentically, it becomes less controllable by external force. Conversely, **systems designed to be easily controllable have low resilience and high vulnerability to collapse**.

This is why power structures often *prefer* forced coherence + collapse cycles to genuine resonance. It's paradoxical but true: collapse can be managed more easily than resonance, because collapsed systems are desperate for any attractor, even a toxic one.

3. Diagnostic Framework: Mapping Power-Sabotaged Coherence

3.1 The Coherence-Power Diagnosis Matrix

To assess whether a system is in coherence collapse due to power sabotage, map three dimensions:

Integration Diagnosis

Coupling direction	Bidirectional feedback between modules	Unidirectional (center→periphery)	No coupling; isolation
Trust in relationships	Built over time; resilient to disruption	Conditional on compliance	Absent; parasitic
Information diversity	Multiple sources, cross-verification	Central source of truth	Contradictory signals; confusion
Redundancy	Multiple paths between nodes	Single critical paths	No paths;

Diagnostic question: Can modules communicate directly and meaningfully, or only through central authority?

Segregation Diagnosis

Indicator	Resonant	Forced	Collapsed
Attractor	Multiple legitimate values/	Single attractor with	No stable attractors;
Autonomy in role	Modules can define own function within system	Function prescribed; autonomy illusory	Roles unstable; identity loss
Resource distribution	Correlated with function, not dominance	Correlated with alignment to center	Arbitrary; unpredictable
Identity sources	Multiple (craft, relationship, meaning)	Single (rank/metric in dominant system)	Identity fragility; external dependence

Diagnostic question: How many genuinely different ways can someone/some module have value here?

Temporal Hierarchy Diagnosis

Indicator	Resonant	Forced	Collapsed
Pace setting	Slow scales constrain fast scales	Fast scales driven by external mandate	Permanent crisis; no governance
Reflection	Structural time for	Reflection eliminated as	Reactive only; no
Cycle phases	Planned r-K- Ω - α cycles	Continuous r-K; Ω - α only crisis-driven	Stuck in Ω or K; no α
Renewal rhythm	Endogenous; self-organizing	Mandated; episodic	Exhaustion without renewal

Diagnostic question: What percentage of system capacity is available for thinking/learning vs. producing/executing?

3.2 Diagnostic Protocol

For any system (organization, community, policy domain), assess:

1. **Current state on each dimension** (I, S, TH) using the matrix above
2. **Identify power gradients** maintaining that state—who benefits from current configuration?
3. **Distinguish:** Is this coherence collapse, forced coherence, or genuine resonance?
4. **Predict:** What happens if you try to shift without addressing power?

Example application (Dutch education system):

- **Integration:** High forced (all schools tied to central curriculum, testing, funding rules); low resonant (teachers isolated from each other; schools compete not cooperate); low collapsed (some breakdown of trust in system)
- **Segregation:** Extremely compressed—single attractor (academic ranking) dominates; all pathways measured by same metric; forced diversity (vocational tracks exist but are lower status)
- **TH:** Severely inverted—fast scales (test prep, quarterly targets) dominate; slow scales (pedagogy development, trust-building, cultural shift) compressed to nothing
- **Power:** Benefits to central government (control via metrics), to ranking institutions (legitimacy via differentiation), to high-status schools (resource concentration); costs to teachers (loss of autonomy), to struggling students (identity compression), to entire system (no genuine learning, only teaching to test)

Diagnosis: **Forced coherence + incipient collapse.** System appears ordered but is increasingly brittle. Attempts at "reform" (new standards, better training) fail because they don't address the power gradient maintaining the configuration.

4. Intervention Logic: From Diagnosis to Transformation

4.1 Three Paths to Failure

Before sketching what works, map what doesn't:

Path 1: Trying to add resonance without removing power

You introduce "collaborative learning spaces" but they remain under central surveillance. You offer "flexible work" but algorithmic monitoring increases. You create "diversity" but keep single success metric. Result: **false resonance that burns out people faster** because they are now blamed for not "resonating" while constraints remain.

Path 2: Trying to remove power without building resonance

You eliminate top-down rules, but don't build trust and coupling. You "flatten" hierarchy, but don't create meaningful interdependence. Result: **fragmentation masquerading as autonomy.** People are "free" to compete in isolation; system becomes incoherent; old power re-solidifies quickly.

Path 3: Romantic assumption that genuine resonance will spontaneously emerge

Remove constraints and trust people to self-organize. Sometimes works; often doesn't. Result: **collapse.** Without some structural scaffolding, self-organization fails in complex systems. Power fills the vacuum.

4.2 The Correct Sequence: Coupling Before Freeing

Transformation from forced coherence requires a specific order:

Phase 1: Build resonant coupling while power still structures the system

Don't try to remove power yet. But use what power allows to build genuine relationships:

- Create redundant pathways for communication (not just center-to-periphery)
- Build long-term relational structures (mentoring, stable teams, cross-functional groups)

- Establish reciprocal feedback loops (people can meaningfully influence decisions affecting them)
- Create "safe spaces" where modules can experiment and speak

This phase *looks* like normal organizational improvement. But it is actually building social capital and trust that will later allow people to resist domination.

Phase 2: Protect slow scales while fast scales reorganize

Build structural time for reflection, deliberation, cultural development:

- Geplanned α -phases (experimentation cycles, not continuous production)
- Protected deliberation time (actual meetings where decisions are made, not theater)
- Temporal autonomy (people/teams can set their own pace within larger rhythm)

This phase appears to reduce efficiency (it does, in the short term). But it creates the temporal space where genuine transformation becomes possible.

Phase 3: Expand modular diversity within existing structure

Begin opening attractor landscape:

- Create legitimate alternate success metrics (not just ranking)
- Protect pathways that serve different functions (not pseudo-diversity)
- Allocate some resources based on function/need, not dominance

This phase creates surface tension with power structure but can often be framed as "inclusion" or "innovation."

Phase 4: Shift the power gradient itself

Only now do you directly challenge dominance:

- Redistribute decision-making authority (participatory budgeting, governance boards, worker councils)
- Shift resource flows from rank-based to need/function-based
- Eliminate extractive mechanisms (surveillance, coercive metrics)

This phase is politically charged and will be resisted. But Phases 1-3 have built the relational infrastructure and temporal space for people to actually *resist effectively* rather than be re-dominated.

4.3 Intervention Design: Five Leverage Points

Within this sequence, work at these five leverage points (in rough order of accessibility):

1. Relationship Architecture

What: Deliberately build redundant, long-term, cross-cutting relationships

How:

- Stable teams/groups (not annual reshuffling)
- Cross-functional working groups with real decision power
- Mentoring/elder-knowledge preservation
- Physical/ritual spaces that bring people together repeatedly

Why: Trust and information redundancy make modules less extractable and more resilient. They also create the social infrastructure for later resistance.

Power gradient effect: Dominant power prefers isolated, competitive modules that cannot ally. Building relationships is threat to dominance. Can often be framed as "collaboration" or "culture building."

2. Temporal Autonomy

What: Protect and expand the time available for slow-scale processes

How:

- Structural "reflection time" (not optional wellness; scheduled deliberation)
- Cycle-based planning (geplanned r-K- Ω - α phases, not continuous crisis)
- Multi-year timescales for evaluation (not quarterly metrics)
- Rhythm protection (e.g., no-meeting weeks, no email evenings)

Why: Slow scales can only function if they have actual time. This is not luxury; it is structural necessity for coherence.

Power gradient effect: Dominant power relies on acceleration to prevent resistance (no time to think = no time to organize). Expanding slow scales is directly threatening. Often framed as "inefficient."

3. Attractor Expansion

What: Create legitimate diversity in what "success" and "value" mean

How:

- Multiple evaluation frameworks (not single ranking)
- Protect different pathways (not fake choice with single outcome)
- Value different contributions (not just high performers)
- Shift resource flow toward need/function, not dominance

Why: Systems compressed to single attractor are brittle. Diverse attractors create resilience and genuine choice.

Power gradient effect: Ranking and compression serve to concentrate power. Diversification is threatening to centralized control. Often framed as "lowering standards" or "mediocrity."

4. Information Reciprocity

What: Shift from unidirectional surveillance/extraction to genuine feedback loops

How:

- Make information symmetric (center knows what periphery knows)
- Create meaningful feedback mechanisms (people influence decisions, not just receive them)
- Transparent resource/decision criteria
- Regular dialogue, not broadcast

Why: Unidirectional information flow is extraction mechanism. Reciprocity creates accountability and coupling.

Power gradient effect: Surveillance and secrecy protect power. Reciprocal information is destabilizing. Often framed as "inefficient" or "leaking secrets."

5. Participatory Governance

What: Shift decision-making authority from center to affected parties

How:

- Participatory budgeting
- Worker/user councils with real power
- Stakeholder deliberation on policy
- Rotation of authority roles

Why: Governance that includes affected parties produces decisions with high coherence (people actually understand and support them) and creates political space for continued resistance.

Power gradient effect: This directly challenges dominance. Cannot be framed as "efficiency." Usually resisted most intensely. But if Phases 1-4 have been done, it becomes possible.

5. Case Logic: How to Know If It's Working

5.1 Coherence Indicators During Transformation

As you move through the transformation sequence, watch for these shifts:

Integration improvement:

- Increase in cross-module communication that doesn't go through center
- Modules citing each other, learning from each other (not just competing)
- Relationship depth increasing (fewer people, deeper relationships)
- "Grapevine" / informal networks becoming more robust

Segregation opening:

- People expressing alternative identities, not just role-defined
- Multiple legitimate ways to contribute being recognized
- Career/development paths diversifying
- Status stratification flattening (not all flattened, but range compressing)

Temporal hierarchy restoring:

- Actual reflection/deliberation happening, influencing decisions
- Experimentation cycles visible (trying things, learning, adapting)
- Pace slowing (fewer urgent crises, more intentional rhythm)
- Burnout decreasing (more sustainable pace)

Most important: Ethical Friction Coefficient rising

As resonance increases, system becomes harder to externally control. This is *good*. Watch for:

- Articulate resistance to forced metrics
- Collective action on behalf of system (strikes, refusals, demands)
- Self-organization that wasn't mandated from above
- Willingness to accept short-term costs for long-term autonomy

This is how you know resonance is real: the system *refuses* to collapse, even when it's pressured to, because it has built the capacity to reorganize itself.

5.2 What Does NOT Indicate Success

False positives (look good but aren't):

- Forced diversity without resource shift (still single attractor)
- Wellness programs with increased acceleration (meditation + always-on = burnout)
- Flattened hierarchy without power redistribution (chaos that re-solidifies dominance)
- Increased communication without reciprocal influence (more surveillance)

Backlash signs (power reasserting):

- Relationships getting monitored/constrained
- Participation theatricalized but not consequential
- "Pilot projects" that don't scale because they threaten center
- Return to metrics/acceleration when power feels threatened

6. Applying the Framework: Brief Case Sketch

Dutch Mental Health System Transformation

Current state (diagnostic):

- Integration: Forced (all tied to central guidelines, insurance codes, diagnosis manuals); low resilience to variation
- Segregation: Compressed (single metric: diagnosis-treatment-outcome); pseudo-diversity (many treatments, all optimized for same attractor)
- TH: Inverted (fast: crisis intervention, medication, brief therapy; slow: completely absent—no time for meaning-making, cultural shift, slow relationship-building)
- Power gradient: High—psychiatry/pharma set terms; patients are compliant consumers; therapists are protocol-followers

Predicted outcome of current trajectory: Continued mental health crisis + increasing burnout in treatment system + treatment failures that get reframed as patient pathology

Transformation approach:

Phase 1 (Coupling): Build therapeutic relationships while within system

- Protect continuity of therapist-patient relationships (radical in current rotating system)
- Create peer support/self-help groups that operate independently of clinical hierarchy
- Cross-sector dialogue (mental health + education + work + community)
- Establish forums where patients/families directly influence treatment protocols

Phase 2 (Slow scales): Protect time for meaning-making

- Expand "talking cure" beyond optimization (allow long-term meaning work, not just symptom management)
- Create deliberation time for treatment teams (not just case management)
- Multi-year evaluation horizons (not 8-week outcome metrics)
- Protect space for patient development, not just treatment

Phase 3 (Diversity): Open attractor landscape

- Legitimate multiple pathways to wellbeing (not just psychiatric model; include somatic, relational, artistic, spiritual)
- Fund diverse treatment modalities based on evidence AND user preference
- Create role diversity for practitioners (not all following same protocol)

Phase 4 (Power shift): Redistribute authority

- Patient councils with budget authority
- Community participatory evaluation of treatment effectiveness
- Shift from psychiatry-led to patient-led research questions
- Decentralize diagnosis authority (not top-down DSM/ICD)

Expected cascade effects:

- Treatment efficacy increases (more coherent; people understand and support their own care)
- System resilience increases (less dependent on single ideology/leader)
- Professional burnout decreases (people have autonomy; they're not just protocol-followers)
- Cost patterns shift (more preventive, community-based; less emergency intervention)

7. Risks and Hard Truths

7.1 Transformation Always Encounters Backlash

As you move through phases and the power gradient begins to shift, expect:

- **Sabotage of pilot projects** ("this works in microcosm but can't scale")
- **Re-definition of goals** ("we always wanted empowerment; here's our corporate version")
- **Burnout escalation** (paradoxically, as resistance becomes possible, retaliation increases)
- **Financial strangulation** (resources redirected away from transformed units)

This is not failure. This is *proof that you're actually threatening the power structure*. The right response is not to compromise but to deepen relational infrastructure (Phase 1) so the system can withstand pressure.

7.2 Genuine Resonance is Slower Than Forced Coherence

Building resonance takes time. Forced coherence can be imposed in months. This is why power structures prefer it—it appears more efficient.

Transformation timelines:

- **Phase 1 (Coupling):** 6-18 months to establish basic trust; 2-3 years to deepen
- **Phase 2 (Slow scales):** Parallel with Phase 1; visible impact in 1-2 years
- **Phase 3 (Diversity):** 2-3 years to establish legitimate alternatives
- **Phase 4 (Power shift):** 3-5 years to make actual decisions; 5-10 to internalize

This is a **decade-scale transformation** for large systems. Anything claiming faster is likely false coherence.

7.3 You Cannot Transform Without Accepting EFC Increase

Making a system more resonant makes it harder to control. This is feature, not bug.

If your goal is to maintain dominance while appearing to care about wellbeing, you'll fail (or you'll succeed in false coherence, which is worse).

If your goal is genuine transformation, you have to accept that the system will become *less obedient*. People will organize. They will make demands. They will refuse compliance.

This is not chaos. It is **healthy resistance to domination**. The right response is to build governance structures (participatory, democratic) to channel that resistance productively.

8. Conclusion: Coherence as Emancipation

The standard framing of mental health crisis—and organizational crisis, and societal crisis—treats it as a problem to be *managed*: more treatment, better coping, improved resilience within the system.

This approach fails because it doesn't address why the system is in collapse: it is *being held there* by power structures that benefit from that state.

The LRS + Power framework reframes the question:

How do we build systems that are genuinely coherent—that don't require external force to maintain—because they serve the autonomy and flourishing of their parts?

This is not a technical problem. It is a **political and relational problem**. Technical knowledge (about brain, organization, society) is necessary but not sufficient. The hard part is building relationships, protecting temporal space, and creating political space for power to be redistributed.

This framework offers no shortcuts. But it offers something more valuable: **a way to think about transformation that doesn't re-produce the very domination it's trying to escape**.

The three phases (coupling, slow scales, diversity) before the power shift are crucial precisely because they build the infrastructure—social, temporal, cognitive—that makes genuine power redistribution possible. Without them, "empowerment" becomes another extraction mechanism.

With them, you create the conditions for systems to heal themselves: to become resonant, self-maintaining, and genuinely free.

References

Konstapel, J. (2025). "The Living Resonant System – A Unified Framework for Adaptive Intelligence Across Scales." *Hans Konstapel Blogs*.

Holling, C. S. (2001). "Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems." *Ecosystems*, 4(5), 390–405.

Barrett, L. F. (2017). *How Emotions Are Made: The Secret Life of the Brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Seth, A. K., & Friston, K. J. (2016). "Active Inference and the Free-Energy Principle." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 17(9), 558–569.

Rosa, H. (2016). *Resonanz. Eine Soziologie der Weltbeziehung*. Suhrkamp.

Rosa, H. (2005). *Beschleunigung. Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne*. Suhrkamp.

Han, B.-C. (2015). *The Burnout Society*. Stanford University Press.

Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Suhrkamp.

De Wachter, D. (2012). *Borderline Times. Het einde van de normaliteit*. Lannoo.

Raad voor Volksgezondheid & Samenleving (2025). *Op de rem! Voorbij de hypernerveuze samenleving*. Den Haag: RVS.