



The Regime of Probabilities: Toward a New Threshold in Biopolitical Governmentality

Kamuran Gökdağ*

Sıtkı Karadeniz

Abstract: This study aims to theorize the regime of probabilities as a new threshold of biopolitical governmentality, in order to address the explanatory limits of Foucauldian and Agambenian frameworks in accounting for digital, actu-arial, and algorithmic technologies of power, and to offer this concept as a theoretical contribution to the biopolitics literature. These technologies operate upon life as a secular object of governance whose modern genealogy begins with the Hobbesian rupture. Mbembe's necropolitical intervention partially addresses this gap, yet fails to account for the broader logic of probabilistic coordination through which algorithmic differentiation operates. The regime of probabilities designates a new form that biopolitical governmentality has reached through the radicalization of its own internal logic. In this regime, life is operationalized before it attains factual reality, in terms of probable ori-entations, parametric deviations, and potential behavioral sequences. The article theorizes this regime through five interconnected constitutive dimensions before applying this framework to health systems, insurance mechanisms, security apparatuses, and digital platforms. The analysis demonstrates that the regime of probabilities operates through distributive calibration of life, reorganizes the subject's temporal experience from within, and constructs a speculative economy of knowledge that simultaneously produces its own object, its conditions of operation, and its legitimation.

Keywords: Biopolitics, regime of probabilities, governmentality, risk, distributional calibration

Öz: Bu çalışmanın amacı, olasılıklar rejimini biyopolitik yönetimselliğin yeni bir eşiği olarak teorileştirmek; böylece Foucaultcu ve Agambenî çerçevelerin iktidarın dijital, aktüeryal ve algoritmik teknolojilerini açıklamadaki sınırlılıklarını ele almak ve bu kavramı biyopolitika literatürüne teorik bir katkı olarak sunmaktır. Bu teknolojiler, hayatı modern soykütüğü Hobbesçu kopuşla başlayan seküler bir yönetim nesnesi olarak işlemektedir. Her ne kadar Mbembe'nin nekropolitik müdahalesi bu boşluğu kısmen doldursa da, algoritmik ayırıştırma dayanan daha geniş olasılıksal koordinasyon mantığını kuramsal olarak yeterince açıklayamamaktadır. Olasılıklar rejimi, biyo-politik yönetimselliğin kendi iç mantığının radikalleşmesi sonucunda ulaştığı yeni bir biçimi ifade etmektedir; bu rejimde hayat, olgusal gerçekliğe kavuşmadan önce muhtemel yönelimler, parametrik sapmalar ve potansiyel davranış dizilimleri bakımından operasyonel hale getirilmektedir. Makale, bu rejimi birbiriyle bağlantılı beş kurucu boyut üzerinden teorileştirmekte; ardından bu çerçeveyi sağlık sistemleri, sigorta ve finans mekanizmaları, güvenlik aygıtları ve dijital platformlara uygulayarak söz konusu boyutların maddi işleyişini incelemektedir. Çalışma, olasılıklar rejiminin hayatı dağıtarak kalibre etme mantığı içinde işlediğini, öznenin zamansal deneyimini içeriden yeniden örgütlediğini ve hem kendi nesnesini hem işleyiş koşullarını hem de meşruiyet zeminini eşzamanlı olarak üreten spekülative bir bilgi ekonomisi kurduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Biyo-politika, olasılıklar rejimi, yönetimsellik, risk, dağıtım kalibrasyonu

* Corresponding Author

@ Assoc. Prof., Mardin Artuklu University, kamurangokdag@artuklu.edu.tr
Prof. Dr., Mardin Artuklu University, sitkikaradeniz@artuklu.edu.tr

id <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1753-6496>
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3930-4442>

DOI:10.12658/M0815
insan & toplum, 2026.
insanvetoplum.org

Received: 07.06.2026
Revised: 27.07.2026
Accepted: 10.08.2026
Online First: 20.08.2026

Introduction

The historical and structural transformation of political rationality is organized around a question irreducible to the institutional expansion of apparatuses of power: at what threshold does life become the constitutive object and operative ground of political rationality? Addressing this question requires an analytical framework capable of grasping both the ontological status of life and the techniques through which it is governed. Such an inquiry traces how life was gradually displaced from the cosmological, metaphysical, theological, and mystical horizons within which it had long been situated, and reconstituted as an object of governance embedded in risk distributions, population curves, security projections, and patterns of conduct. In ancient thought, life was conceived as part of an ethical relation to truth; within theological traditions, it was situated within an existence oriented toward a transcendent telos; within mystical traditions, it appeared as a permeable mode of being that transcended the biological limits of the organism. Hobbes's intervention marks one of the defining moments of modern political thought precisely at this ontological level. For Hobbes, political association arises because individuals seek "the foresight of their own preservation, and of a more contented life thereby" (1996, p. 117). He likewise grounds the legitimacy of political obligation in the function of protection, treating preservation as the ultimate rationale of obedience (Hobbes, 1996, p. 140). The preservation of life thus becomes both the primary purpose of political association and the principal basis of sovereign legitimacy. What the Hobbesian rupture produces is a displacement: life ceases to be situated within orders that confer meaning upon it from beyond. Instead, it is reconstituted as a fragile, secular, and governable object whose security becomes the central concern of political order. The significance of Hobbes's intervention, however, lies in the way political order is organized around the anticipation of dangers that have not yet materialized. Hobbes's characterization of the state of nature as a condition of "continuall fear, and danger of violent death" (Hobbes, 1996, p. 89) points to violence projected into the future as a persistent possibility. Threats that have not yet occurred are drawn into the sphere of political calculation in advance. With Hobbes, the preservation of life and the anticipation of future dangers become inseparable dimensions of the same political order.

The logic of protection carries a paradox of its own. The power that secures life and the power that intervenes in life arise as mutually formative dimensions of the same political structure. Sovereignty founded on preservation claims the authority to determine the conditions under which life will be preserved, the forms

through which it will be organized, and how it will be governed. What emerges from this paradox is an object continually reshaped through the very processes by which sovereignty reproduces its legitimacy. The threshold opened by Hobbes cannot be equated with biopolitics in any direct sense. Rather, it marks an ontological rupture through which life moves to the center of political thought as a problem of security, preservation, and anticipation. Over time, however, the political ontology organized around preservation exceeds the sovereign logic from which it emerged. Foucault captures this transformation through the concept of biopolitical governmentality. The anatomo-political, regulatory, and normalizing mechanisms of biopolitical rule reach deep into the biological processes of populations, extending the scope of intervention well beyond the logic of protection (Foucault, 2003, pp. 239-265). Power gradually shifts from the sovereign's exceptional decision toward disciplinary mechanisms of normalization, increasingly shaping life as a population to be managed, regulated, and optimized. Yet Foucault's formulation leaves a significant tension unresolved, one that Agamben brings into focus. The expansion of biopolitics reworks sovereignty and carries it forward in a different form. The founding exclusion of the political order continues to operate once bare life becomes the figure over which sovereign power retains its ultimate claim (Agamben, 1998, pp. 15-29). Both perspectives, however, encounter limits of their own. Foucault approaches the problem through the biological processes of populations, institutional forms of regulation, and statistical norms; Agamben explains it through the relationship between sovereignty, exception, and law. The dimension that eludes both frameworks is brought into focus by Mbembe. Political power operates through the unequal allocation of the conditions of livability among populations, making visible colonial and racialized forms of ordering that neither Foucault's population-centered analysis nor Agamben's sovereignty-centered account can adequately address. What Mbembe's framework leaves to one side, however, is the calculative logic through which such distributions become possible in the first place. Mbembe's (2003, pp. 11-40) analysis stops at the thresholds of livability themselves. Contemporary governmentality, by contrast, increasingly operates upon the fields of probability and variation through which those thresholds are produced before they ever become objects of intervention.

The theoretical trajectory traced thus far suggests that the transformation underway on the surface of intervention in contemporary governmentality cannot be grasped simply through new technologies, new forms of data, or new institutional arrangements. Biopolitical, thanatopolitical, and necropolitical perspectives each illuminate significant dimensions of the process through which life became

the central object of political rationality. A more fundamental shift has yet to receive adequate theoretical treatment. Intervention is directed primarily at life's not-yet-realized probabilistic structure. Emerging trajectories, behavioral tendencies, and future variations become subject to calculation and differentiation before the thresholds of intervention have even taken shape. What is at stake, therefore, is the field of probabilities through which life is made governable in advance. This shift also carries consequences for the temporality of political intervention. Sovereignty operates through a logic of transgression and punishment oriented toward the past; disciplinary power anchors itself in the present through continuous surveillance and normalization; contemporary governmentality, by contrast, is organized increasingly around the future. Behavioral tendencies that have not yet appeared, foreseeable social disruptions, potential biological deviations, and emergent forms of life are drawn into an anticipatory architecture and made actionable before they materialize. Biopolitical governmentality thereby establishes a relation to the unrealized capacities, variations, and trajectories through which collective existence may take shape. Large-scale data infrastructures and algorithmic systems provide the operative medium through which this relation unfolds. Big data functions as an epistemic terrain through which social reality is continuously reconstructed (Kitchin, 2014). The normalizing techniques of biopolitical governmentality, the sovereign logic foregrounded by thanatopolitical analyses, and the selective processes highlighted by necropolitical analyses each capture important aspects of contemporary governance. The question of the common operational rationality that holds these dimensions together, however, has gone unanswered. A theoretical framework capable of grasping the apparently dispersed operations of contemporary governmentality within a shared logic, one that accounts for its internal rationality, epistemic conditions, and governmental effects, has yet to be fully developed. This article proposes the concept of the regime of probabilities as a framework for precisely addressing this gap. Before such a concept can be elaborated, the forms through which probability has entered contemporary political rationality and how it has become an object of intervention require closer examination. The governmental relation to what has not yet occurred raises a fundamental question concerning the political constitution of the possible itself, and with it, the theoretical trajectories along which the relationship between probability and power has recently been reconceptualized.

From the Politics of Possibility to the Regime of Probabilities

Over the past two decades, the relationship between contemporary governmentality and the not-yet-realized has attracted sustained theoretical attention, generating a range of distinct yet convergent analytical frameworks. Massumi's theory of preemption, Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism, and Amoore's politics of possibility stand among the most systematic contributions to this literature. Proceeding from different conceptual vocabularies, all three address how power operates on futures that have not yet materialized, extending its reach beyond the limits of observable reality. Yet despite their differences, each framework conceptualizes power as encountering life in forms that are already partially formed, as a latent threat, an appropriable autonomy, or a speculative object awaiting authorization. Each, therefore, grounds this relation in a specific logic of intervention. This anchoring is an effect of the conceptual architecture through which each framework is constructed. What gives these approaches their analytical force simultaneously circumscribes what they can illuminate. Their limits are internal, built into the very terms on which each is organized.

Shoshana Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism offers one of the most comprehensive accounts of the new logic of accumulation characteristic of the digital economy. Her framework turns on the concept of behavioral surplus, data that exceeds what is required for service provision is appropriated and processed by machine-intelligence systems into prediction products, which then circulate within behavioral futures markets as a new source of capital accumulation. The form of power generated by this mechanism is what Zuboff designates as instrumentarian power. As these processes develop, the aim shifts from predicting behavior to actively shaping it, producing an extensive architecture of behavioral modification that turns individuals into objects of automated computation (Zuboff, 2019). Yet the central concern driving the analysis is the political threat that surveillance capitalism poses as a form of power that expropriates individuals' capacity to author their own futures while eroding the foundations of democratic life (Zuboff, 2019, pp. 329-341, 516-525). This framing determines both the reach and the boundary of the inquiry. Behavioral surplus, prediction products, and instrumentarian power are all mobilized in service of a single diagnostic question, how do these mechanisms threaten autonomy and democratic order? The theory's analytical energy flows almost entirely toward identifying and defending what has been taken, the future, individual self-determination, and the conditions of collective self-governance. Consequently, the informational architecture underlying these processes is never

examined as a distinctive terrain of power, one that operates according to its own logic independently of commercial expropriation. The computational rationality through which potential life is made calculable and actionable before it materializes, the operational logic by which data-driven systems convert unrealized tendencies into objects of calculation, remains an uninvestigated presupposition. Within this framework, probability serves as an instrument of commercial calculation. How probabilistic reason might itself constitute a terrain of power, organizing life through calculation before any act of appropriation takes place, is a question that surveillance capitalism, by its own terms, is not positioned to ask (Zuboff, 2019, pp. 93-97).

Massumi's analysis of ontopower (2015, pp. 3-16) represents one of the most philosophically ambitious attempts to conceptualize preemption as a qualitatively distinct logic of power. The doctrine of preemption provides its point of departure, leading Massumi to distinguish ontopower from both prevention and deterrence. Prevention addresses known causes, deterrence seeks to contain a threat that has already taken shape, preemption, by contrast, transforms an emergent and ontologically indeterminate potential into the very ground of political action. What is most original in this account is the mechanism through which ontopower engages that potential. Threat is drawn into the present through affective processes; through what Massumi calls affective attunement and affective activation, a cause that has not yet occurred is made to generate effects in the present, such that the future cause becomes the animating principle of power itself. As the threat is actualized, actualization in turn generates new potentials for threat, producing further affective pressures that sustain the cycle without closure. Massumi characterizes this dynamic as ontogenetic, in that ontopower continuously regenerates its own operative ground by bringing threats into existence. Potentiality thus figures as a volatile field of tension, drawn into the present through affective pressure and held in a state of imminent actualization. The philosophical depth of this account, however, is inseparable from its structural constraint. Across the architecture of ontopower, potentiality is never disentangled from threat: the enemy in formation, the attack without shape, the violence perpetually on the verge of eruption. Affective activation presupposes this horizon; without it, the mechanism loses its intelligibility. The future cause likewise derives its force from conditions of far-from-equilibrium instability. Power and potentiality are thereby framed as standing in a relation of confrontation. The forms of knowledge through which potentiality is rendered recognizable, calculable, and governable before it takes shape are not examined as a problem in their own right. Ontopower is

concerned with how potentiality is effectively actualized, not with the epistemic conditions that make it available to power in the first place. The affective pressure of threat forecloses that inquiry precisely: once power encounters potentiality as already mobilized and poised for eruption, the prior conditions of its knowability recede from view. This foreclosure has consequences for the status of probability within the framework. Massumi treats probabilistic calculation as a limitation that ontopower surpasses, understood as the threshold beyond which prevention and deterrence can no longer operate and preemption takes over. Cast as an epistemic ceiling, probability cannot be approached as a rationality capable of organizing life through its own internal logic. How probabilistic reason might itself function as a terrain of power that constitutes potential is a question the framework is structurally unable to pose.

Louise Amoore's politics of possibility offers one of the most systematic accounts of how contemporary security practices exceed the limits of probabilistic calculation. The organizing axis of the theory is precisely this movement beyond probability. For Amoore, probabilistic calculation functions as an epistemic obstacle, since it carries forward past data, depends on causal chains, and treats uncertainty as a deficiency to be corrected. What it cannot grasp are threats that have not yet taken form and resist causal specification. Security practices, the theory argues, develop a distinct rationality at precisely this point, in a speculative, open-ended mode of reasoning that draws the unknown into the space of decision. Amoore develops the epistemic architecture of this rationality through three interconnected concepts. The risk derivative displaces the causal logic of traditional actuarial calculation, operating instead through the possible future configurations of heterogeneous elements. The life signature reconfigures the individual as a distributed trace that exceeds the boundaries of identity and is defined through capacities for possible association. Together, these concepts converge in the dividuated subject, a figure fragmented by lines of risk, detached from biographical continuity, and perpetually restructured along shifting axes of possible relation (Amoore, 2013, pp. 55-128). Within this architecture, all three concepts are organized around a common axis, the authorization of security decisions. The risk derivative authorizes a decision, the life signature establishes its invisible epistemic infrastructure, and the dividuated subject names the fragmented body upon which that decision is enacted. Sovereignty is dispersed through practices of delegation that circulate across consultancy networks, software designers, biometric systems, and border algorithms. This is precisely where the theory's strength and its constraint coincide. The concepts of risk derivative, life signature, and dividuated subject are pur-

pose-built to investigate the epistemic conditions that make speculative security decisions possible. As a consequence, the politics of possibility remains bound to a moment of decision, a practice of authorization, and the forms of subjectivity these generate. This attachment is structural, produced by the opposition between probability and possibility upon which the entire framework rests. Once probabilistic calculation is cast as a closed and insufficient epistemic form that possibility must surpass, it can no longer be approached as a governmental rationality in its own right, one that distributes and calibrates life through calculable parameters, ranges of deviation, and future capacities without requiring any moment of speculative decision. The broader institutional domain in which probabilistic reason itself becomes a terrain of power, organizing life before thresholds of intervention have taken shape, lies beyond what the politics of possibility is constructed to address. Its most generative conceptual move, therefore, simultaneously defines the limits of what the framework can conceptualize (Amoore, 2013, pp. 6-54).

Taken together, these three frameworks illuminate how contemporary power engages the future capacities of life from within distinct but converging theoretical positions. Yet the very precision of each account also marks its limit. All three conceptualize life as an object that power encounters, acts upon, and transforms, whether as a threat potential, a behavioral surplus, or a speculative object awaiting authorization. What this shared assumption leaves unexamined is a prior question, through what epistemic and governmental processes does life become available to power as an object in the first place? Life is the terrain through which power generates its own conditions of knowledge, legitimacy, and operation. Probability, in this context, functions as the medium through which power organizes life before its trajectories, capacities, and forms have fully emerged, distributing and calibrating potential. None of the frameworks examined treats probability in these terms. Each positions it either as an epistemic ceiling to be overcome, a calculative instrument of commercial prediction, or an insufficient form of knowledge that speculative security must transcend. The consequence is that one of the most significant transformations of contemporary governmentality, the emergence of probabilistic reason as a foundational principle of governmental rationality, has left an unaddressed gap in the literature. The concept of the regime of probabilities is advanced precisely to address this gap.

Positioning the regime of probabilities against its most proximate rivals requires engaging their strongest formulations directly, since each grasps something the others miss and each, in its own way, approaches the threshold this article seeks

to name. Srnicek's (2017, pp. 9-43) account of platform capitalism locates the platform's emergence within the long downturn in manufacturing profitability that began in the 1970s, and defines the platform, with considerable precision, as an infrastructure that positions itself between users and as the ground upon which their activities occur, thereby securing privileged access to record them. This formulation comes remarkably close to describing an operative ground of the kind this analysis develops, yet Srnicek's own explanatory commitments route it back toward capital, platforms exist because data has become a new raw material for accumulation amid stagnant production, and the different platform types he identifies, advertising, cloud, industrial, product, lean, form a taxonomy of accumulation strategies organized entirely around their position within a business model. Facing the monopolistic tendencies he documents, Srnicek's own political conclusion proposes state regulation, public ownership, or collectivized platforms as correctives (Srnicek, 2017, pp. 126-129), interventions that redistribute ownership of the very capacity to anticipate and record that this analysis names as governmental. Yeung's (2019, pp. 25-31) analysis of algorithmic decision-making distinguishes concerns organized around process, around outcomes, and around predictive personalization, and within this framework she names the specific harm of what she calls algorithmic imprisonment, in which systems trained to treat past behaviour as the most reliable predictor of future behaviour leave individuals with no path back from their own recorded history, an anxiety she develops through the erosion of a right to be heard before an unbiased decision-maker, the two components of due process against which her critique of automated systems is measured. Even her conceptualization of predictive personalization, the hypernudging through which systems continuously reconfigure services in light of population-wide behavioural tracking, is assessed for its capacity to manipulate a subject presumed capable of autonomous, reflective choice (Yeung, 2019, pp. 34-35). The erosion she documents is thus diagnosed throughout in the vocabulary of the individual moral agent, entitled to a hearing, to reasons, to the possibility of self-authored change, the same vocabulary whose presupposed subject the regime of probabilities treats as already dissolved into a continuously recalculated profile. Ritzer's (2019, pp. 175-179) extension of McDonaldisation into computational settings names a fifth, paradoxical dimension of rationalized systems, the irrationality of rationality, in which efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control generate their own dysfunctions, dehumanization, disenchantment, the multiplication of unintended costs. This self-critical move places Ritzer closer than the other two approaches to the phenomenon examined here, yet his genealogy remains resolutely Weberian,

rationalization a trajectory beginning in bureaucracy and industrial organization that digital tools intensify, and the irrationality he identifies figures throughout as its cost, a friction accumulating alongside efficiency's advance. The regime of probabilities locates indeterminacy differently, as the medium continuously reworked to sustain governmental operation itself, so that what for Ritzer marks the limit of rationalization's success becomes, on this framework, the operating principle of a distinct governmental logic, one for which Weber's genealogy of bureaucratic rationalization offers a precursor, its explanatory reach ending precisely where this further logic begins. Each approach thus supplies indispensable material, the platform as ground for capture, the anatomy of algorithmic harm to the individual subject, the paradox internal to rationalization, organizing that material around capital, moral agency, and organizational efficiency respectively, terms this analysis relocates as downstream effects of a governmental logic that precedes them.

The Regime of Probabilities: The Distributive Calibration of Life

The regime of probabilities designates a new historical threshold at which life becomes governable before it attains empirical actuality, through probable trajectories, realizable variations, and foreseeable patterns of deviation. Under this regime, life becomes a primary object of political rationality, a dynamic matrix of shifting tendencies, variable behavioral formations, and actionable probabilities. Although this transformation may appear to rest on the classical distinction between risk and uncertainty (Knight, 1921), the regime of probabilities is, in fact, organized around the continuous conversion of uncertainty into calculable parameters. Uncertainty thereby ceases to mark the outer boundary of governmental reason as an irreducible domain of the unknown. It becomes instead the generative medium through which life is assessed, differentiated, and calibrated, the productive ground of governmental operation. Contemporary biopolitical governmentality approaches life as a field of unrealized capacities for variation, potential trajectories extending into the future, and reconfigurable probability formations. At this threshold, life takes shape as a shifting probabilistic field that serves simultaneously as the object and the operative ground of political rationality. What distinguishes the regime of probabilities is its capacity to organize this field through a multilayered logic that connects heterogeneous probabilistic formations while preserving their relational specificity. The formation of potential life as a primary governmental concern simultaneously activates five interconnected dimensions of operation. The first is a distinctive temporality that renders the future immanent to the present. The second is a new threshold of epistemic visibility through which uncertainty

becomes measurable and gradable. The third is a logic of differential distribution that allocates life processes across variable modes of intervention. The fourth is a set of techniques of modulation that sustain this dynamic organization in continuous circulation. The fifth is a relational spatiality through which these dimensions are held in ongoing articulation. This configuration requires intervention to adapt continuously to the fluid rhythms through which life unfolds. These dimensions, through which life becomes foreseeable, calculable, differentiable, and subject to continuous modulation, make up the interconnected planes of a single coordinative rationality, one that holds the five dimensions together as a unified operative logic rather than as isolated mechanisms.

The temporal dimension of the regime of probabilities designates a mode of governmental reason that draws the not-yet-realized into the structure of the present. The three dominant temporal forms of modern power each organize political intervention differently. Sovereign power looks backward. Transgression precedes the law, and punishment functions as a corrective directed at what has already occurred. Disciplinary institutions are anchored in the present, enclosing bodies within organized spaces and subjecting them to continuous observation, training, and normalization (Foucault, 1977, pp. 135-169), a temporal organization inseparable from the growing centrality of speed to modern control and its capacity to operate through real-time anticipation (Virilio, 2007, pp. 136-145). Biopolitical governmentality extends the horizon further, making fertility rates, epidemiological variations, and patterns of circulation statistically legible and approaching life as a process amenable to regulation across time (Foucault, 2007, pp. 65-79). Even so, the future within this framework figures as a projected extension of present processes. The regime of probabilities reconfigures this temporal organization at its core. The future becomes an operational domain folded back into governance itself. Anticipatory architectures are designed to identify behavioral trajectories before they materialize, detect emerging clusters of vulnerability, and map potential patterns of circulation in advance. The object of intervention shifts accordingly, from the event to the conditions of its possible emergence, from what has occurred to what bears the capacity to occur (Massumi, 2015, pp. 3-18). At the center of this reorganized temporal field stands potential life, rendered calculable, governable, and actionable through anticipatory arrangements that treat the future as something already subject to intervention.

Uncertainty and probability are not synonymous within this framework. Uncertainty designates what remains structurally unresolved, the persistent absence

of any stable, once-and-for-all knowable outcome. Probability names the operational form through which that unresolved condition is made workable for governmental action without ever being settled. Converting uncertainty into a measurable object reproduces it in calculable form, continuously reprocessed, so that governmental reason can act upon what remains, in principle, undetermined. The epistemic apparatus that renders uncertainty measurable simultaneously determines the relations within which life acquires governmental significance, specifying which forms of mobility warrant attention, which behavioral patterns are admitted into the field of calculation, and which trajectories are deemed actionable. Potential life is thereby drawn into an active process of distribution, differentiated according to varying degrees of permeability, circulated across shifting zones of contact, and organized within a continuously reordered field of intervention. Life processes enter the operational coordinates of governmental reason as gradable variables, positioned and repositioned within probabilistic fields (Ewald, 1991, pp. 197-210). What drives this distributive logic is the management of asymmetries among probabilities, which maintains differentials of permeability through which power can continuously recalibrate access, circulation, and vulnerability. Individuals figure within this arrangement as relational profiles composed of probabilities, vulnerabilities, and capacities for movement. As indeterminacy is translated into calculable differentials, probability becomes the productive medium through which socio-political intervention is organized. The question becomes how probability fields are stratified by varying intensities, structured by unequal thresholds of permeability, and organized by differentiated rhythms of circulation. Biopolitical reason accelerates certain mobilities within highly permeable environments while attenuating others through zones of constrained circulation, apprehending life as a set of differentiated flows distributed across variable speeds, asymmetrical circulatory spaces, and shifting intervention thresholds. This distributive logic is irreducible to the frameworks of exclusion and exposure to death developed by Agamben (1998) and Mbembe (2003), to Rancière's (1998) problematic of subjectivation, or to Esposito's (2008) immunitary paradigm. What is at stake is the coding of life's internal probability fields through variable rationalities of regulation, their classification according to differential future capacities, and the organization of socio-political space as a series of graduated continuities. The biopolitical intervention characteristic of the regime of probabilities produces a mobile logic of governance that holds life processes in a state of continuous adjustability.

The differential distributions sustained by the regime of probabilities require a complementary organizational logic, one that keeps life continuously available to

intervention without allowing it to congeal into fixed, stable forms. Deleuze's concept of modulation provides the most precise theoretical instrument for grasping this logic. Modulation operates through open fields of control that maintain life in states of continuous adjustment (Deleuze, 1992, pp. 4-7). Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of multiplicity and the rhizome extend this perspective by shifting attention from fixed centers toward evolving connections, shifting intensities, and mobile configurations (1987, pp. 3-25). Taken together, these concepts illuminate modulation as an organizational rationality that sustains the productivity of life's indeterminacy. Biopolitical governmentality, approached through this lens, treats potential life as a continuously adjustable field of relations. The governing concern is the maintenance of conditions under which life remains permanently open to recalibration. Governance accordingly orients itself toward the relational thresholds through which life acquires form, the shifts in intensity through which it assumes different strategic values, and the arrangements that continually reorganize its distribution. What modulation introduces into the regime of probabilities is the capacity to hold intervention thresholds themselves in a state of adjustment, responsive to life's own capacities for variation and transformation. Temporal anticipation, epistemic calculability, and differential distribution each depend upon this modulative openness. Without it, the processes of formation they set in motion would crystallize into fixed outcomes. The continuity of the regime of probabilities is therefore a continuity of ongoing recomposition, a field of intervention that sustains itself precisely by never closing upon itself.

Temporal anticipation, epistemic calculability, differential distribution, and modulative circulation do not operate as parallel mechanisms but as independent ones. Their articulation raises a further question, through what mode of coordination do these dimensions act upon one another? This is the problem to which relational spatiality responds. The operations of the regime of probabilities unfold not in isolated moments of intervention but across networks of interconnection linking institutional settings, data infrastructures, and anticipatory mechanisms. As Aradau and Blanke observe, "if prediction is understood as entwined with governmental apparatuses that shape the conduct of individuals and multiplicities, then it is also about time/space interventions rather than only about taming the future" (2017, p. 13). Within such networks, the different dimensions of the regime amplify one another. Anticipatory projections generate epistemic calculations. Those calculations reorganize distributive arrangements. Distributive interventions are sustained and adjusted through modulative processes. These modulations, in turn, reshape the anticipatory projections from which the cycle proceeds. What

this recursive dynamic produces is a relational field in which each dimension continuously reconfigures the conditions under which the others function. The regime of probabilities is therefore spatial in a specific sense, in that it generates a field of coordination within which temporal, epistemic, distributive, and modulative processes are held in ongoing relation, each redistributing the conditions through which life is rendered knowable, governable, and subject to intervention. This field shares important affinities with Foucault's concept of milieu, which addresses how circulation becomes governable through the organization of environmental conditions (Foucault, 2003, p. 245; DeCaroli, 2021), and with Deleuze's conceptualization of modulation, which operates across open fields of control. Yet relational spatiality is neither reducible to the management of circulation nor to the continuity of modulative control. Its concern is the recursive dynamic through which heterogeneous governmental processes act upon and reconfigure one another, casting life as intelligible in terms of the probable trajectories, encounters, and vulnerabilities that these intersecting processes continuously produce and reorganize.

The Operational Surfaces of the Regime of Probabilities

The translation of probabilistic reason into a mode of governmental rationality generates the material and technical environments through which life becomes distributed across differentiated institutional settings. Recording, correlating, and maintaining the not-yet-realized trajectories of life in circulation requires contact surfaces such as hospitals, insurance networks, border crossings, data centers, and digital platforms, through which these trajectories can be made governable. The regime of probabilities accordingly acquires its operative ground within extensive networks of technical arrangements. Enabled by digital infrastructures, these arrangements function as multilayered computational environments that extend beyond nation-state boundaries and continuously reconfigure the terms of sovereignty (Bratton, 2015). What health systems, financial mechanisms, security apparatuses, and digital platforms share is that each operates as a site through which probable trajectories are translated into concrete practices, behavioral patterns are differentiated across zones of contact, and life is shaped across variable degrees of access. The dimensions of the regime, temporal transformation, epistemic organization, differential distribution, modulation, and relational spatiality, are not distributed among these surfaces as separate mechanisms. All five operate simultaneously across every institutional domain, though each surface generates its own centers of gravity that leave certain dimensions more prominent than others. Temporal anticipation and modulative adjustment are most prominent within health

systems. Epistemic organization and differential distribution are most prominent within insurance and financial mechanisms. Relational spatiality around thresholds of circulatory permeability is most prominent within security apparatuses. Real-time behavioral modulation is most prominent within digital platforms. Risk protocols, access procedures, screening systems, data circulation networks, and behavioral classification mechanisms function as the administrative connectives through which these dimensions are held in contact within the same institutional surface, keeping the probable trajectories of life manageable within a mobile relational field that never fully closes upon itself.

Among the institutional surfaces of probabilistic governance, the health field occupies a distinctive position. Biological vulnerabilities spread rapidly through contact networks; disease processes are increasingly entangled with patterns of population mobility; and delayed interventions carry the capacity to produce effects at scale. These conditions have reoriented health systems toward the advanced processing of probable risk trajectories, transforming them from reactive clinical sites into technical-administrative networks that maintain population movements under continuous surveillance, situate behavioral patterns within risk categories, and treat probable biological deviations as actionable before they materialize. As Rose and Abi-Rached (2013, pp. 9-21) demonstrate, developments in neuroscience have further extended this reorientation by generating a new biopolitical field in which human behavior becomes governable in advance through probabilistic modeling. The WHO's pandemic preparedness frameworks (WHO, 2021) exemplify how the health field has been restructured around biological vulnerabilities that have yet to emerge. During COVID-19, epidemiological risk maps, contact tracing systems, and population-based risk categorizations approached life through variable sustainability clusters differentiated according to degrees of biological vulnerability. The CDC's risk classification systems correlated age, chronic illness, mobility density, and contact patterns to translate biological vulnerabilities into predefined intervention fields at the population scale (CDC, 2020). Health systems thereby ceased to be delayed-response mechanisms and became probabilistic governance environments that keep the probable trajectories of biological circulation open to continuous intervention. The significance of the health field within the regime of probabilities, however, extends beyond anticipatory monitoring. It deepens into an optimization logic that continuously adjusts life's capacity for sustainability in response to changing conditions.

Epidemics, intensive care constraints, and the chronic scarcity of clinical resources have pushed health systems toward a different kind of rationality, oriented toward calculating the thresholds at which life remains sustainable. The SOFA scoring systems deployed during COVID-19 exemplify this reorientation. Built around organ failure probabilities, survival expectations, and recovery trajectories, these instruments distributed lives across differentiated vulnerability clusters, each carrying its own sustainability coefficient (Emanuel et al., 2020, pp. 2049-2055). Crisis standards of care for disaster and epidemic scenarios followed a comparable logic, restructuring clinical priority around mobile biological thresholds that governed how limited resources were mobilized (NASEM, 2012). Clinical decision-making thus acquired the structure of a probabilistic priority matrix, calibrating life's sustainability against shifting operational conditions. What this reorganization set in motion was a stratified access architecture. Intensive care infrastructures, vaccine distribution networks, digital health platforms, clinical triage systems, and mobility-based verification applications each functioned as a permeability layer, determining through which bodies, at what speed, and under what conditions protection became materially available. The vaccine rollout made this stratification unmistakable, as high-income countries secured early access while structural delays compounded across low-income regions, producing an access differential that tracked infrastructural position (WHO, 2022). The EU's digital health certificate extended this geometry further, translating vaccination status, test results, and immunity records into technical thresholds that governed movement across border crossings and public spaces alike (European Commission, 2021). Contact tracing systems similarly folded health data into daily mobility patterns, keeping population circulation subject to real-time access determinations. Across these arrangements, the health field continuously processes the probable trajectories through which life's sustainability is distributed, withheld, or deferred.

Insurance and finance represent the institutional surface where the regime of probabilities acquires its most epistemically dense materialization. Two axes organize its functioning, the framing of risk as measurable, and the graduated stratification of social circulation through differentiated degrees of permeability. Contemporary financial organization reframes economic life, understood as productive relations, property arrangements, and income distribution, as a probabilistic coordination field in which future uncertainties, deviations, and sustainability thresholds are continuously recalculated. Pasquale's (2015) analysis of the "black box society" captures one dimension of this, in which financial algorithms and credit-scoring systems produce opaque power arrangements whose decision-making

rationales remain concealed, displacing individuals from the very processes that govern their economic lives. The historical foundation underlying this opacity lies in the systematic absorption of risk and probability into economic calculation alongside capital (Beck, 1992, pp. 19-24). Once uncertainty is incorporated as a foundational principle, it ceases to be a deficiency awaiting correction and becomes instead an active medium through which economic access is reorganized and population mobilities are differentiated. As risk becomes the reflexive product of modern organizations themselves (Giddens, 1991, pp. 109-111), financial systems generate anticipatory profiles of what individuals are likely to do. Credit scoring systems, insurance premium algorithms, investment ratings, and digital payment infrastructures form the institutional skeleton of this surface, positioning individuals not according to what they have done but according to the probable trajectory of their future economic conduct. FICO-type models draw on payment history, debt load, consumption patterns, and financial mobility to produce such trajectories. Crucially, as Beckert (2016) demonstrates, when economic actors treat these projections as real, the projections generate real consequences, not prediction but a performative loop through which imagined futures are made actual. Through this loop, the economic subject becomes a continuously recalculated risk intensity, always provisional, always subject to revision. What the insurance system adds to this picture is corporeality. Where financial profiling operates at the level of economic behavior, insurance brings the logic home to the body. Ewald's (1991) foundational move, the dissolution of individual potentials into collective statistical distributions, has since migrated from actuarial tables to biological surfaces. Telematics systems in automobile insurance track driving speed, braking patterns, and usage frequency in real time, reconfiguring premiums based on the individual's unfolding behavioral record. Wearable devices in private health insurance extend this further, converting heart rate variability, sleep patterns, physical activity, and daily movement into a continuous stream of behavioral risk indicators. Economic access is thereby detached from civic entitlement and bound instead to the individual's perpetually updated performance profile. Risk filters in advance, determining the conditions under which life enters economic circulation before any claim is ever made, and rendering the body itself a site of ongoing probabilistic inscription.

This filter logic extends beyond individual profiling into the broader architecture of the financial field itself. Credit access, insurance coverage, investment opportunities, and borrowing capacity are not distributed according to fixed entitlements but organized as mobile fields of access calibrated against variable sustainability coefficients, integrating populations into economic circulation at graduated and

unequal degrees of permeability. The consequences are concrete. Individuals with low credit scores face systematically higher interest rates. Populations in certain regions find themselves structurally excluded from insurance coverage. High-risk users encounter restricted transaction capacity within digital financial systems. Each of these outcomes is a local expression of the same differential permeability logic operating at scale. The algorithmic risk modeling systems that expanded rapidly in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis deepened this tendency, redirecting banks and investment institutions toward behavioral data analyses that factor in current financial capacity and anticipated vulnerability trajectories. Financial circulation now moves through continuously reworked anticipatory risk matrices. This is a shift that Beck's (1992, pp. 19-24) account of risk socialization cannot fully capture, precisely because what has emerged is the asymmetric concentration of risk within populations. Credit ratings, premium structures, behavioral data pipelines, and algorithmic financial infrastructures together produce a mobile set of intervention coefficients that govern the terms on which individuals enter different economic circulation fields. The cumulative effect is a transformation of economic life itself, from a legal domain of property organized around relatively stable norms into a probabilistic access architecture continuously rewritten through data flows. Within this architecture, economic equality becomes the variable output of a self-reproducing hierarchy of probabilities, recalculated with every data update and never fully settled.

Where the financial surface filters life's economic trajectories in advance, the security surface operates on circulation itself, shaping movement through differential regimes of permeability before it occurs and grasping threat epistemically before it takes form. What makes this layer distinctive is a structural transformation in its architecture. The modern surveillance model no longer resembles the panopticon's centralizing gaze. It functions instead as a distributed and heterogeneous relational plane through which multiple data flows are continuously linked (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000; Lyon, 2018). State and corporate origins increasingly blur within this integrated complex, which penetrates across all layers of life and structurally narrows the field of movement available to the political subject. Security apparatuses govern both the speeds at which different forms of life may move and the access thresholds they may pass through under varying levels of surveillance intensity. Airport screening systems, biometric recognition infrastructures, border control algorithms, and intelligence-based data networks form the material skeleton of this arrangement, speculative power surfaces that continuously scan, classify, and redistribute circulation. Foucault's observation that "the specific space of

security refers then to a series of possible events; it refers to the temporal and the uncertain, which have to be inserted within a given space” (2007, p. 35) identifies the organizing logic. However, the classical spatial arrangements it referred to have since been superseded. Lyon’s argument that location-based surveillance techniques are no longer adequate to the present moment (2018, pp. 7-28) points precisely to this displacement. The relevant space is no longer geographic but computational. Elmer’s (2004) concept of “profiling machines” captures the operational form this takes, systematic informational economies that process personal data continuously and reconstitute individuals as profile objects. As global risk networks expand, the ground of ontological security that Giddens (1991, pp. 35-38) associated with institutional continuity is progressively detached from those moorings and rewoven through data production and anticipatory risk management. Security thereby ceases to function as the stable backdrop against which threats occasionally emerge. It becomes a mode of governmental production in which instability is continuously anticipated, modeled, and operationalized in advance.

Contemporary security apparatuses retain the classical logic of admission, deciding who passes and who does not, as one layer of their functioning, but embed it within a more comprehensive filtering regime that continuously recalculates which risk profiles are permitted to enter circulation at all. The political rationality of this filtering regime is made visible in the profiling logic that operates through mobility, as in the observation that “Effective controls and coercive restrictions of freedom concentrate on specific targets. (...) September 11 has reinforced the idea that the struggle against these threats justifies the profiling of certain people’s potential behaviors, especially if they are ‘on the move’” (Bigo, 2006, p. 63). What Bigo identifies as a post-9/11 legitimation has since become structural, in that the anticipatory profiling of mobile populations operates as the routine epistemic ground of security governance without requiring a declared emergency to authorize it. The infrastructure of this regime is an anticipatory classification technology working through data flows. Airport and border screening systems, biometric passages, digital passports, and behavioral risk algorithms form its material surfaces (Amoore, 2013), surfaces that do not interrupt circulation so much as redistribute it according to gradients of differentiated intensity. Enclosed bodies give way to continuously adjusted circulation flows. Fixed institutional walls give way to an access geometry rewritten in real time through data (Deleuze, 1992, pp. 4-7). Smart city systems, facial recognition infrastructures, algorithmic surveillance networks, and behavioral analytics platforms are the everyday forms this geometry takes. By scanning population movement without interruption, these systems mark poten-

tial deviations as actionable before they materialize, determining in advance the conditions under which its movement remains possible. Security thereby migrates from an apparatus that regulates circulatory capacity to one that produces it. Life's field of possible movement is continuously produced through the permeability architecture within which it unfolds.

Digital platform infrastructure occupies a singular position among the operational surfaces of the regime of probabilities, the layer through which the others are joined into a common computational field. What distinguishes this surface is its integrative function, in that the advance-processing logic of biological vulnerabilities operative in health systems, the behavioral risk profiling characteristic of financial mechanisms, and the anticipatory filtering geometry of security apparatuses are drawn together here within a single algorithmic rationality, their previously fragmented probabilistic outputs brought onto a shared ground. Amoore's description of algorithmic learning captures what this convergence produces in practice, as in the observation that "We train our algorithm to understand what a protest is and is not," and "it gets better," "adapting day by day," as it iteratively learns with humans and other algorithms. The process of learning "what a protest is" from the clustered attributes in data and modifying the model continues when the algorithm is later deployed in the city or at the border (Amoore, 2020, pp. 1-2). The point is that algorithms classify through a process that relocates the conditions of classification from identifiable decision-makers to the systemic level, displacing ethical accountability in the same movement. Beyond their function as infrastructures for communication and information exchange, digital environments thereby acquire what might be called a relational production layer, a stratum in which the conditions of behavioral occurrence and the architectures of preference are actively generated (Zuboff, 2019, pp. 8-12). Algorithmic recommendation systems, content ranking mechanisms, and personalized feeds operate at this layer by identifying tendencies not yet crystallized into preferences and intervening precisely when conduct is taking shape. The subject produced within this arrangement is, as Cheney-Lippold (2017, pp. 1-12) argues, assembled through variable and continuously updated data identities, a computational object. Fixed institutional spaces and delayed normative frameworks give way to open, perpetually adjusting control mechanisms (Deleuze, 1992, pp. 4-7). Power works as an immanent rationality that continuously reconstitutes the conditions under which behavior forms and attention flows. The platforms through which this rationality is most pervasively exercised, including TikTok, YouTube, Instagram, and subscription-based streaming services such as Netflix, organize content distribution through a probabilistic engineering

logic that calculates what users are likely to become inclined to select, shaping inclination before it becomes choice. This dynamic extends Ritzer's (2019) account of McDonaldization, in which efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control were identified as the organizing principles of rationalized institutions. Within algorithmic platforms, calculability and predictability are reproduced through continuously updated recommendation algorithms, while control is exercised through the algorithmic shaping of user attention itself.

The digital surface generates the institutional form of relational spatiality, one of the regime's theoretical dimensions. Relational spatiality, as elaborated earlier, names the mobile coordination field within which temporal anticipation, epistemic calculability, differential distribution, and modulatory continuity continuously amplify one another's effects. Digital infrastructure enacts precisely this logic at the level of institutional practice, functioning as the meta-surface through which the biological risk profiles produced by health systems, the behavioral scores generated by financial mechanisms, and the circulatory filters maintained by security apparatuses are brought onto a shared computational ground. What is distinctive about this articulation is that these outputs transform one another's intensities as they circulate, producing effects none of the contributing surfaces could generate independently. Luhmann's (2017) account of trust as a complexity-reducing mechanism within social systems illuminates what this displacement has entailed, in that digital platforms have progressively absorbed the reduction function that trust once performed, replacing it with algorithmic assurance practices that operate without the relational commitments trust requires. The trajectory Sztompka (2003, pp. 13-14) traces from personal trust relations to institutional mechanisms extends further still, arriving at algorithmic anticipation and profiling as the dominant mode through which social complexity is now managed. The consequences unfold across surfaces in a recursive loop. Biological vulnerability data feeds into financial risk profiles. Financial mobility patterns trigger security filters. Security filters reshape health access thresholds. The entire articulation operates continuously, without the closure that any single intervention might otherwise impose. The subject that emerges from this circulation is a data intensity profile, perpetually recalculable across economic behaviors, political tendencies, cultural preferences, and spatial mobilities, structurally prevented from attaining the status of a completed self. Uncertainty persists within this arrangement as a generative operational ground, continuously converted into calculable differentials and governed as such (Amoore, 2013, pp. 11-15). Digital platforms, now operating as integrated data infrastructures that simultaneously feed insurance risk assessments, credit evalua-

tions, security filters, and health projections, recombine the fragmented probabilities dispersed across operational surfaces into a single modulatory regime. Digital life is thereby situated within a governmental ecosystem in which probabilities are continuously reproduced, rebalanced, and asymmetrically redistributed.

Conclusion

The process through which life has become the constitutive object of governmental reason is not a problem that political thought has resolved. Every attempted resolution deepens it. Each rationality that seeks to render life calculable embeds that calculation within life itself, and this embedding opens a new ground of calculation, enabling political rationality to remake itself on terrain it has itself produced. The concept of the regime of probabilities names the threshold at which this recursive dynamic has arrived. Power organized over life has settled within life's own probabilistic structure, operating there, reproducing there, and distributing itself from there. At the point where governmental reason transforms life into an immanent operational ground, the question of where power ends, and life begins, loses its analytical purchase. The boundary does not shift; it dissolves. And this dissolution does not appear as clarification but as the disappearance of the very terms through which the distinction was drawn. The philosophical consequences of this dissolution exceed what the classical epistemic categories of governmentality can accommodate. Three movements define the epistemic rupture that the regime of probabilities produces, each departing from a classical assumption, that knowledge is built upon life as a pre-given object, that uncertainty is a deficiency to be corrected, and that deviation is a threat to be contained. It examines life as the very condition of knowledge's production. It positions uncertainty as a productive medium. It processes deviation as the raw material from which governmental reason continuously draws. These three movements together transform the relation between knowledge and its object: knowledge establishes in advance the forms in which reality will become possible. The relation is one of production, design, and anticipatory calculation. At this threshold, governmental rationality incorporates its own knowledge order into the generative process it oversees, deepening into a speculative economy of knowledge that simultaneously frames the forms in which reality will emerge, contains that framing as part of the calculation itself, and produces its own object, its conditions of operation, and the grounds of its legitimization in a single recursive movement.

To distribute and calibrate life: the philosophical weight carried by this formulation cannot be fully met by the customary concepts of the governmentality literature. Distribution, in the sense operative here, denotes the setting of life in circulation across differentiated degrees of intensity, speed, and permeability. Calibration, similarly, denotes the continuous readjustment of the standard itself, keeping the threshold that determines what will count as possible in a state of perpetual movement. Together, these two operations collapse the temporal structure through which the subject has historically related to its own life. Within the regime of probabilities, the subject persists as a probability intensity continuously recalculated, and this mode of existence dissolves the continuity of experience from within. The computational cycle reshapes the past as a data cluster, the present as a moment of correlation, and the future as a pre-processed set of probabilities already subject to intervention, replacing accumulation, experience, and anticipation as the terms through which time was once related to life. What these two movements produce together is a governmental logic that operates without anchoring life to any fixed referent, normalizing without stable norms, and regulating without settled rules. Whether and how a subject formed in these terms might recover a relation to its own future that exceeds the terms of its calculation remains the question this analysis cannot close, because the regime itself structurally forecloses the ground from which such a question could be answered from within. This is where the transformation that began when modern political thought first reconstituted life as a secular object of governance has arrived: power weaves itself into life's probabilistic texture from within, transforming that texture into the ground of its own speculative calculation, and life's compulsion to exist upon this ground is the silent and most consequential effect of a governance that never closes upon itself.

Building on this analysis, several avenues for further inquiry emerge. Across its five interconnected dimensions, temporal anticipation, epistemic calculability, differential distribution, modulatory continuity, and relational spatiality, the regime of probabilities demonstrates a coherent governmental logic that this article has traced through four institutional domains, health systems, insurance and financial mechanisms, security apparatuses, and digital platforms. In each domain, probabilistic calculation shapes life itself as a calculable, modulatable, and continuously recalibrated object. This iterative operation is what distinguishes the regime of probabilities from the configurations of biopolitical power theorized by Foucault, Agamben, and Mbembe, since it reorganizes life's own temporal and epistemic structure from within. These findings also open several avenues for empirical inqu-

iry. Comparative research could examine how the regime of probabilities operates differently across regulatory regimes that impose formal constraints on the scope of algorithmic differentiation. Further work might also investigate the lived experience of individuals governed under this regime, including how they perceive, resist, or internalize probabilistic profiling, a dimension the present theoretical framework does not address directly. Finally, future studies could extend the analysis to domains not covered here, such as education, labor markets, and urban infrastructure, in order to test the generalizability of the five constitutive dimensions proposed in this article.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Amoore, L. (2013). *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security Beyond Probability*. Duke University Press.
- Amoore, L. (2020). *Cloud Ethics: Algorithms and the Attributes of Ourselves and Others*. Duke University Press.
- Aradau, C., & Blanke, T. (2017). *Politics of Prediction: Security and the Time of Government*. Routledge.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Sage Publications.
- Beckert, J. (2016). *Imagined Futures: Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics*. Harvard University Press.
- Bigo, D. (2006). "Security, Exception, Ban, and Surveillance." In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* (pp. 46-68). Willan Publishing.
- Bratton, B. H. (2015). *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty*. MIT Press.
- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). (2020). COVID-19 Risk Classification System. <https://www.cdc.gov>
- Cheney-Lippold, J. (2017). *We Are Data: Algorithms and the Making of Our Digital Selves*. New York University Press.
- DeCaroli, S. (2021). "Foucault's Milieu." *Ex-position*, 45, 117-140.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October*, 59, 3-7.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Elmer, G. (2004). *Profiling Machines: Mapping the Personal Information Economy*. MIT Press.
- Emanuel, E. J., et al. (2020). "Fair Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(21), 2049-2055.
- Esposito, R. (2008). *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. (Translated and with an Introduction by Timothy Campbell). University of Minnesota Press.
- European Commission. (2021). *EU Digital COVID Certificate Framework*. <https://ec.europa.eu>
- Ewald, F. (1991). "Insurance and Risk." In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 197-210). University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* (D. Macey, Trans.). Picador.

- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford University Press.
- Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). "The Surveillant Assemblage." *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.
- Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. (R. Tuck, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kitchin, R. (2014). *The Data Revolution: Big Data, Open Data, Data Infrastructures and Their Consequences*. Sage.
- Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Luhmann, N. (2017). *Trust and Power*. (H. Davis, J. Raffan and K. Rooney, Trans.). Polity Press.
- Lyon, D. (2018). *The Culture of Surveillance*. Polity Press.
- Massumi, B. (2015). *Ontopower: War, Powers, and the State of Perception*. Duke University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2003). "Necropolitics" (L. Meintjes, Trans.). *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.
- NASEM (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine). (2012). *Crisis Standards of Care: A Systems Framework for Catastrophic Disaster Response*. National Academies Press.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press.
- Rancière, J. (1998). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (J. Rose, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Ritzer, G. (2019). *The McDonaldization of Society: Into the Digital Age* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Rose, N., & Abi-Rached, J. M. (2013). *Neuro: The New Brain Sciences and the Management of the Mind*. Princeton University Press.
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform Capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Sztompka, P. (2003). *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Virilio, P. (2007). *Speed and Politics*. Translated by Mark Polizzotti. Semiotext(e).
- WHO (World Health Organization). (2021). *Health Systems Resilience Guidance*. <https://www.who.int>
- WHO (World Health Organization). (2022). *Global Preparedness Monitoring Report*. <https://www.who.int>
- Yeung, K. (2019). Why worry about decision-making by machine? In K. Yeung & M. Lodge (Eds.), *Algorithmic Regulation* (pp. 21–48). Oxford University Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.

