

Surveillance and Neoliberalism in Jonathan Franzen's *The Corrections*

ジョナサン・フランゼン『コレクションズ』における監視とネオリベラリズム

Hibiki ENDO

遠藤日葵

Abstract

This paper examines how the theme of surveillance appears in Jonathan Franzen's *The Corrections* (2001) and how it connects with the emergent mode of neoliberalism. In the Lambert family, there are multiple layers of surveillance operating on the body and psyche of family members. To begin with, domestic surveillance manipulates at the dinner table where Enid and Alfred discipline their child during dinner by monitoring him until he finishes his meal. This scene reflects what Michel Foucault states as a discipline producing “docile bodies.” However, power relationships in family are never stabilized, making the bonds of family fragile. In Gary Lambert's family, it is not parents but his child, Caleb, who monitors the house with surveillance cameras. In case of Gary, he observes his father, Alfred Lambert, in terms of his market value. It is not until Alfred loses his function as “homo economicus” due to disease that he is released from surveillance.

The case of Denise shows another form of surveillance—self-surveillance. As if coping with the practice of Panopticon, she internalizes how others see her and disciplines herself in the relationships with Don Armour, Brian Callahan, and Robin Passafaro. Her recognition of male desire leads to the recognition of herself as a human capital, thus she virtually acts as a self-regulating homo economicus.

Overall, *The Corrections* displays how one of the principles of neoliberalism,

deregulation, and the concomitant absence of governmental control force the characters to live in the market-oriented society with a sense of surveillance. The episodes of Corecktail and Aslan, newly developed mood-altering substances, illustrate how pharmacology shifts responsibility from the government and corporations to consumers, who must monitor risks of medication by themselves. Chip's experience in Lithuania also shows the absence of government, where people are oppressed just by bare violence. Altogether, the novel explores how under neoliberalism, surveillance structure domestic life, the self and the market.

Keywords: Jonathan Franzen, *The Corrections*, surveillance, neoliberalism, family, market

1. Introduction

Surveillance becomes the part of our life. Developments of technology enable us to have surveillance on others a lot easier and less uncomfortable. It has been even more deeply rooted in our lives. In *The Corrections* (2001) by Jonathan Franzen (1959 –), there are multiple layers of surveillance operating. *The Corrections* is the story of a white, middle-class family from the Midwest—the Lambert family. The Lamberts consist of parents, Alfred and Enid, and their children, Gary, Chip, and Denise, all of whom are already adult and independent, having moved out from their parents. Each one of them suffers from various troubles in their lives and it leads to dysfunction within the family itself.

While *The Corrections* can be read as a traditional ensemble drama of a family, it is also known as the novel that depicts the living conditions in neoliberal society. In *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction* (2021), Manfred B. Steger and Ravi K. Roy define neoliberalism as the economic and political movement in which free market encourages the minimum interference of the government. They introduce three essential factors in neoliberal policies that are known as “the D-L-P Formula:

(1) Deregulation (of economy); (2) Liberalization (of trade and industry); and (3) Privatization (of state-owned enterprises)” (23).

In addition to the formula of political economy, it is imperative to note how human subjectivity is constructed in the age of neoliberalism. Michel Foucault (1926 – 1984) points out the concept of homo economicus in *The Birth of Biopolitics* (1978 – 1979), claiming it as “the power gets a hold on him to the extent, and only to the extent, that he is a *homo aeconomicus*. That is to say, the surface of contact between the individual and the power exercised on him, and so the principle of the regulation of power over the individual, will be only this kind of grid of *homo aeconomicus*” (252-3). Foucault explains that in neoliberal society, people are governed only as homo economicus through their economic choices such as investment. “The grid of homo economicus” is the framework that connects people and the power that enables them to be governed. In *The Corrections*, the characters are clearly depicted as homo economicus surviving under the principles of neoliberalism.

Other neoliberal elements can be observed as well. James Annesley, in “Market Corrections: Jonathan Franzen and the ‘Novel of Globalization’” (2006), discusses whether *The Corrections* succeeds in portraying the “globalized” society and market. Aleksandra Zuzanna Leniarska, in “‘He stopped to lower his window and say hello’: Jonathan Franzen, Neorealism and De-politicized Communitarianism” (2024), argues that novels by Franzen, includes *The Corrections*, though he publicly criticized neoliberalism, his novel’s form and plot as the novel of “neorealism” actually reinforces a neoliberal logic. As these scholars have addressed the issues related to neoliberalism in *The Corrections*, this paper will examine how surveillance within the novel works as a key element of neoliberal governance. In other words, I will argue how policies and concepts of neoliberalism—homo economicus, self-regulation, and deregulation—are linked to the several forms of surveillance enacted by the characters.

2. Domestic Surveillance and Homo Economicus

Through the story of the Lambert family, a variety of surveillance, or the cases of quasi-surveillance, occur between the members. For example, Enid frequently calls Gary to ask about his family's plan for Christmas, hoping that they will come back to St.Jude; then Caroline, the wife of Gary, has been criticized by him for eavesdropping on the phone. This episode shows an act that can be deemed surveillance, of inspecting what other members are doing and trying to hold it under control, is conducted even from *within*—the household.

Domestic space is a site of surveillance in *The Corrections*. One of the notable exercises of surveillance is performed when the original Lambert family is having dinner together. Despite Enid's effort, Alfred is not acknowledging her housework and not giving enough credit. In order to counter the husband's neglect, Enid deliberately cooks horrible dinner; for Enid, "The Dinner of Revenge" (293) is meant to torture Alfred. Then everyone else in the family, including their children Gary and Chip, is also forced to participate in that disaster. Among the family, more than Alfred who is the original target of the revenge, Chip suffers the most. He cannot tolerate it so he just stares at the dish and remains seated without eating anything. Enid keeps an eye on him for a while; however, being tired of his resistance, she leaves the table at last. Due to the absence of Enid, the responsibility to watch over the child shifts to Alfred and he takes the position of monitoring Chip. This is what can be called domestic surveillance by parents over children in the name of "discipline." Even though parents having control over their children through a disciplinary act of supervision are considered very common, this episode is of worth for theoretical consideration.

In *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975), Michel Foucault ponders on the relation between discipline and surveillance as "[a] 'political anatomy,' which was also a 'mechanism of power.'" It defined how one may have a hold over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what ones wishes, but so that

they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies" (138). Foucault explains that discipline is not only making people obey the order; it is the training for subjects to behave in a specific way and through this training they would turn into "docile bodies." In the dinner scene in *The Corrections*, Alfred's domestic surveillance on child functions as discipline, a procedure of training him to be "docile." Even in a small personal space such as a dining room for a rural family, the mechanism of surveillance and discipline is being exercised.

Along with the emergence of neoliberalism and its socio-political order, however, the monitoring relationship of parents and children, in which it is parents who are monitoring their targets for disciplinary purposes, can be unstable and even changed. The shift of the relationship of parents and children with the exercise of surveillance is seen in Gary's family. Gary, the first Child of Alfred and Enid, marries Caroline, who used to be a lawyer, and they have three children, Caleb, Aron, and Jonah. One day, the one of their children, Caleb, claims that "I want to put a room under surveillance" because it is his new hobby (178). Caleb's infatuation with surveillance starts with the use of photography, but as time goes by the gadget that he wants to employ switches to computers. Gary assumes Caleb's tactics: as long as he mentions it as "hobby," his parents would buy the equipment for him. Gary is opposed to giving him unnecessary gadgets because it would ruin the growth of his child's imagination. However, Caroline has an opposite view of parenting compared to Gary's; in fact, Caroline's favorite parenting book is called "*The Technological Imagination: What Today's Children Have to Teach Their Parents*" (180), which emphasizes children as the creative consumers of technology. Opposite to the view of Gary, who spends his childhood playing with ice cream popsicles and building jails and an electric chair with them, the parenting book asserts that the imagination of children would not be developed by cheap items with which Gary used to grow up drawing pictures and making crafts. Instead, juvenile imagination should be developed by

electronics.

This episode is telling in considering how neoliberalism works in *The Corrections*. Compared to Gary's childhood, children in the age of neoliberalism are more involved in the market economy and should be active as consumer. Growing up as a consumer in the free market, a child is expected to become homo economicus in the future. In the neoliberal society, children are no longer seen as immature ones that should be kept away from the market. Rather, they are the ones who are already targeted as the consumers to participate in the market. From this viewpoint, unlike Gary, Caroline is more willing to provide the gadgets to her children that she believes would train them as creative consumers.

Even though Gary refuses to provide Caleb with surveillance gadgets, the former later discovers that there is a surveillance camera already set up on the top of the cabinet. From the surveillance camera placed by Caleb to monitor his family, the power relationship between parents as surveillant and children as the ones under surveillance collapses and reverses, and children are released from being the target of surveillance and becoming the ones to monitor—now that Caleb is the one who is monitoring and performs the control over his parents.

This reversal of authority is also enacted in the relationship between Alfred and Gary. In the past, as mentioned before, Alfred has had control over his children; he even designates himself as boss and his children as subordinates. However, the power relation in the Lambert family cannot evade the transformation either. Alfred used to work as an engineer for Midland Pacific Railroad, and he has inventions with patents. Axon Corporation has suggested that they purchase his patent. Since Gary believes his father's invention is more beneficial than Axon's offer, Gary discovers his father's invention is applied to the new medicine called "Corecktail." He considers using this medication for Alfred's devastating health condition. This scene embodies the reversal of power relationship—now the son is managing the father. That is why Gary has a dream of Alfred in an electric chair while he is holding the button to control it in his hand:

... he slipped briefly into a room in which his father had been strapped into an electric chair and fitted with a metal helmet, and Gary's own hand was on the old-fashioned stirrup-like power switch, which he'd evidently already thrown, because Alfred came leaping from the chair fantastically galvanized, horribly smiling, a travesty of enthusiasm, dancing around with rigid jerking limbs and circling the room at double-speed and then falling hard, face down, wham, like a ladder with its legs together, and lying prone there on the execution-room floor with every muscle in his body galvanically twitching and boiling— (269).

In contrast to his childhood relationship with his father, Gary starts to designate himself as the supervisor of the parent. Seeking medical treatment for his father and protecting the value of the patriarch's patent, Gary appears to be a loving son. However, rather than the dedicative lover of his family, he conducts himself as *homo economicus*. As the individual living in a neoliberal society, he observes Alfred as the one who possesses potential market value. Acknowledging the value of his father, he attempts to gain maximum profit by maintaining control over his father. His sense of guilt is still observable in his dream of executing patricide; however, he needs to act as *homo economicus* who seeks financial profit in place of his father who may no longer be able to perform the role.

While Gary manages the patent instead of his father, other Lambert family members neglect Alfred. The absence of attention toward Alfred also indicates the loss of his ability as *homo economicus*. How Enid and children try to evade attention to/from him is repeatedly mentioned in the novel. For instance, Enid strives to maintain order in the Lambert house by being "a guerrilla" to avoid provoking the husband's anger (6). She indeed dedicates herself to preventing his explosion of rage. To do so, rather than exercising surveillance over Alfred, Enid is just monitoring his surroundings and then he is released from being the target. That is why, during a cruise trip, because he is no longer considered as an object of monitoring, Alfred falls into the ocean without Enid's notice. In this case, he is liberated from

the relationships of surveillance as soon as he no longer functions as homo economicus. Alfred used to be an excellent engineer at Midland Pacific Railroad, but after he has retired, he suffers from Parkinson's disease and dementia, lose his passion, and traps himself in the basement. His disability prevents him from practicing as homo economicus; with hallucination and physical disability, Alfred forfeits his ability to control and define himself as a self-entrepreneur. As Enid acknowledges that the husband is shut away and has trapped himself in the basement, she begins to focus on maintaining and observing the surroundings, not Alfred himself.

On Christmas, Alfred finally recognizes himself as a disqualified homo economicus. When he has trouble putting the Christmas lights on, he laments as follows: “[i]n the old days, Christmas lights had come in short string that were wired serially. If a single bulb out or even just loosened the socket, the circuit was broken and the entire string went dark By the time Denise was old enough to help the lights, the technology had advanced. The wiring was parallel, and the bulbs had snap-in plastic bases. A single faulty light didn't affect the rest of the community but identified itself instantly for instant replace....” (532-3). In the past, if one bulb of Christmas lights is inoperative, it requires the whole replacement. However, since the technology has developed, Alfred mourns, even if a single part is defective, that specific one needs to be identified and replaced—no renewal of the whole system is required. These Christmas lights are a metaphor of his family, and one broken light is referred to as himself. He grieves that past family relationships are that if one has been dysfunctional, others follow it or at least have a certain effect on the family as a whole. This episode not only implies that the children are independent from the parents but also metaphorizes the fragile family bond between homo economicus in neoliberal society. Even if one becomes deteriorated, others will remain functionable as homo economicus as if the defunct one would not have any influence on other parts. Even after Alfred is sent to a nursing facility and eventually dies, the other members appear to remain functioning. Enid settles down and is satisfied with her new life, though her children have not committed to her expectations. For Gary, his

relationship with Caroline is finally moving forward in recovery. It also applies to Chip and Denise who are both being laid off; Chip moves to the Midwest and married a Jewish doctor with twins; Denise remains unmarried and has no children, but she manages to open a new restaurant in New York. Every family member adjusts well to life without Alfred as homo economicus.

This tenuous relationship reflects the modern conditions in family life under neoliberalism. Rather than emphasizing the importance of society and family bonds, neoliberalism prioritizes the individual in the spotlight. Margaret Thatcher's famous quote, "There is no such thing as society," epitomizes the faded social connection. In *Liquid Modernity* (2000), Zygmunt Bauman (1925-2017) claims that "the policy of deliberate 'precarization' conducted by the operators of labour markets finds itself to be aided and abetted (with its effects reinforced) by life policies, whether adopted deliberately or embraced by default. Both converge on the same result: the fading and wilting, falling apart and decomposing of human bonds, of communities and of partnerships" (163). The emergence of neoliberalism generates the evacuation by fluidizing the collective frameworks such as a nation, society, and relationships. In *The Corrections*, the characters intuitively sense the transformation of nature in the familial relationship. Gary realizes that "the nature of family life itself was changing—that togetherness and filiality and fraternity weren't valued the way they were when he was young" (190). Reflecting on her past relationship, Denise recognizes her demand for the evacuation from family expectations. While Alfred fails to maintain himself as homo economicus due to his disease and the collective frameworks, such as society and family, is no longer functional, the individuals as homo economicus manifest themselves and forge their own path under neoliberal conditions.

3. Self-Surveillance and Self-Regulating

In *The Corrections*, the practice of surveillance is not only limited to monitoring how others act and react in a specific context but also related to the way the self is constructed in the age of neoliberalism. Denise, the youngest child of the Lambert family who dedicates herself to being a top chef, can be analyzed as an actor of self-surveillance. In light of the theoretical framework by Michel Foucault, she is the character who is not only considered as homo economicus but also the one who operates surveillance over herself and leads it to self-regulation.

Foucault asserts in *The Birth of Biopolitics* (1979) that individuals gain the role of being entrepreneurs of themselves. Each attempt to maximize their own market value can be understood as investment in themselves through education and migration. In the case of Denise, her internship at Midland Pacific Railroad is the perfect example of her investment in herself; her relocation from the Midwest to Philadelphia to pursue her career as a chef reflects her as an aspiring self-entrepreneur. Along with elevating herself through the migration, she is required to operate surveillance over her own self to raise her market value.

Foucault (1975) introduces the mechanism of self-surveillance in reference to the situation of prisoners under the Panopticon, a design of institutional buildings conceptualized by Jeremy Bentham, an English social reformer. In the system of Panopticon, the observation tower is central, surrounded by cells of prisoners. Confined into each cell, captives are forbidden to communicate with each other. As far as they can see, they fail to recognize whether they are observed by jailors or not. The guards succeed in operating surveillance over them without being noticed. Under such circumstances, Foucault states “[h]e who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraint of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection” (202-3). During this uncertainty of observation, prisoners begin

to internalize the gaze of power and discipline themselves to behave based on their assumption of the guards' expectations. Rather than physical detention, the prison shape-shifts its emphasis to psychological incarceration. The prisoners, those who are the targets of monitoring, transform into the surveillants of themselves. The whole mechanism of self-surveillance functions as internalization and discipline. As if tracing this procedure of subjection, in *The Corrections*, Denise struggles to control herself in accordance with the power relation and expectation that bind her.

Denise's act of self-surveillance is observable in her relationship with Don Armour, Brian Callahan, and Robin Passafaro. Don Armour is one of her colleagues when she works as an intern at Midland Pacific Railroad. Having a sexual relationship with him, she recognizes for the first time that she is bestowed with desirable aspects for men, even though not fully understanding exactly what it is. When she becomes intimate with Don, she compares him with other males, noting:

Don Armour wanted her minutely, inch by inch. She appeared to make brilliant sense to him. Simply possessing a body had never much helped her but seeing it as a thing that she herself might want—imagining herself as Don Armour on her knees, desiring the various parts of herself—made her possession of it more forgivable. She had what the man expected to find. There was no anxiety to his location and appreciation of each feature. (428-9)

She learns how to be favorable to men by perceiving a specific desire from Don and undoubtedly gains confidence in her body. It is Don who empowers her in employing her body as the object of man's desire. As if she is applying the mechanism of self-surveillance, she internalizes his gaze of desire in their relationship. Then, she controls herself as his desirable object.

In neoliberal society, however, Denise not only needs to be a desirable object in a romantic relationship but also perceives herself in the measurement of market value. Through the process of internalization and discipline with self-monitoring, she behaves as if she becomes valuable human capital. She reflects on her body

as a valuable resource from the perspective of a self-entrepreneur. The character of Denise depicts the overlap of self-surveillance and neoliberal subjectivity—how she internalizes herself as desirable for males and simultaneously as a commodity, the resource of market value. In the case of Denise's relationship with Brian Callahan, this feature is more remarkable. At first it seems that she is just applying a similar strategy as she does to Don Armour. However, in the intimate relationship with Brian Callahan, the practice of self-surveillance is concerned with business and market. Brian Callahan is depicted as the character who is willing to be the sponsor and owner of Denise's new restaurant. Brian invents a product whose patent is worth a great amount of money, enabling him to build a new restaurant. He selects Denise as the chef of his new business. As preparation to start a new restaurant, he requests that she travel Europe for several weeks. He tells her that he will catch her up later, so she first assumes that he is coming with his family. However, she later discovers he chooses not to accompany his family. During a trip with Brian, she notes:

She waited in vain, as they walked the length of the quai after dinner, for Brian to brush her hand with his. He kept looking at her hopefully, as if to be sure she had no objection to his stopping at this store window or veering down that side street. He had a happy canine way of seeking approval without seeming insecure. He described his plans for the Generator as if it were a party that he was almost certain she would enjoy. Clearly convinced, in the same way, that he was doing a Good Thing that she wanted, he backed away from her hygienically when they parted for the night in the lobby of the Deux Iles. (456)

Again, as if overlapping with her recognition of the affair with Don Armour, Denise applies self-surveillance and disciplines herself. However, a slight difference is introduced in her relationship with Brian. In the case of Don Armour, it is her own self-surveillance that internalizes the perspective of the male gaze through his desire, which leads her to recognize the attractiveness of her body as the value of a commodity. In the relationship with Brian, it seems as if he is attempting to have control

over her by forcing her to self-monitor. Denise sees Brian keeping “looking at her hopefully” (456). His observation is formed by the expectation that functions as the gaze of power. As she perceives it through his behaviors, Denise accordingly acts as if she is applying the form of self-surveillance.

Brian's tacit manipulation is not meant to alter Denise as a favorable lover. The aspect of Brian as a self-entrepreneur has manifested in the relationship with her. During the trip, the purpose of his accompanying her is not to seek a romantic flirtation. A more surveillance-like process of evaluation to determine if she is suitable or controllable for his new restaurant is going on between them. As the sponsor of the restaurant, he needs to ensure that she remains under his control. In her inspection of the progress of her new restaurant, “The Generator,” she eventually realizes that she has been seduced and betrayed by him. She expects the ingenuity and excellence of her dishes to be the core of the restaurant, not the profit-centered nature of the business. During the visit, however, she is reconvinced that the restaurant is owned by him, not her. Brian's new restaurant is no longer a place where only Denise's ability as the chef matters. She continues to believe that she makes all the decisions by herself, but then, she finally recognizes that Brian is actually the one who controls her decision-making by way of her internalized self-surveillance.

Although it is emphasized Brian is the one who has been monitoring and following Denise, she is not only a docile object but also functions as an actor in the power relation: Denise is conducting surveillance over him as well—more specifically, watching over his family. While she interacts with Brian, she becomes intimate with his wife, Robin Passafaro. At the beginning, Robin treats her impolitely, but as soon as Denise confesses that she has no more interest in men, her attitude softens. Because Brian undermines her hope for the new restaurant, she feels attracted to Robin instead. Denise seeks an intimate relationship with Robin, and eventually, they end up having a sexual relationship. This is the time for revenge—Denise, in order to accomplish her mission of creating a rift between the couple, stakes out in their house and starts to monitor Brian's family. While she visits their

house, she becomes close not only to Robin but also to their daughters. Seeking to determine whether their marriage is no longer functioning, she even inspects the couple's bedroom. Thus the surveillant relation between Brian and Denise becomes mutual. As both of them aim to maximize their own desire and to act as a self-entrepreneur, the motives can be considered as those of *homo economicus*.

In the very end, however, Denise realizes all of her motives and cravings stem from her own family affair. Denise thinks back on her life and the relationships she has had with family members. She reviews it as follows:

After Brian Callahan had fired Denise, she'd carved herself up and put the pieces on the table. She told herself a story about a daughter in a family so hungry for a daughter that it would have eaten her alive if she hadn't run away. She told herself a story about a daughter who, in her desperation to escape, had taken refuge in whatever temporary shelters she could find—a career in cooking, a marriage to Emile Berger, an old-person's life in Philadelphia, an affair with Robin Passafaro. But naturally these refuges, chosen in haste, proved unworkable in the long run. By trying to protect herself from her family's hunger, the daughter accomplished just the opposite. She ensured that when her family's hunger reached its peak her life would fall apart and leave her without a spouse, without kids, without a job, without responsibilities, without a defense of any kind. It was as if, all along, she'd been conspiring to make herself available to nurse her parents. (577 – 578)

She reflects that Brian, Robin, and her ex-husband Emile Berger, are “temporary shelters” for her escaping from her family's expectations. Despite how she has been falling short in building good relationships with her folks, she realizes that her failure is ascribed to her own choice, decision and action. This reflection, in a way, also illustrates the feature of self-surveillance—she is so much aware of the outer expectation of her being the caretaker for the family that she believes she needs to release herself from the role. In successfully fails against her will, against her internalized

self-entrepreneurship, Denise is made to fit into the expectations of her family.

4. Market Surveillance and Deregulation

In *The Corrections*, domestic surveillance and self-monitoring outline the relationships of the characters. It can be seen, as argued above, as a way of dramatizing humans in the age of neoliberalism. Simultaneously, the characters are being swayed away by unauthorized substances and unstable political conditions. Aside from family relationships, a couple of unauthorized pharmacological products, such as Corecktail, and the anarchy in Lithuania, are in the spotlight in the novel. These episodes invite a consideration into another feature of neoliberalism—deregulation. As Stegar and Roy (2021) explain, deregulation is one of the important factors of neoliberalism. Deregulation, the reduction of governmental intervention in the free market, has become the grand rule in the neoliberal world. Due to the absence of governmental regulations, surveillance over the market has been assigned mainly as the task of civilians. In other words, with the retreat of the government, the citizens as homo economicus are in charge of monitoring the market—practitioners of market surveillance. In *The Corrections*, the issue is addressed in the episodes of psychoactive substances. Enid and Gary face the struggle of the use and abuse of unapproved treatments and substances; the episodes of the illegal products reveal how responsibility is imposed and imprinted on each consumer. Not only in the field of pharmacology, the theme of deregulation also reaches out to political conditions. The novel portrays Chip's experience in Lithuania, where the absence of a functioning government forms an anarchy-like nation that can be compared to neoliberal governing in the United States. In both cases, the consequences of deregulation and how it may demand new modes of surveillance are satirically dramatized.

In the case of pharmacology, it should be noted that the aspect of biopolitics intertwines with neoliberalism. Michel Foucault defines biopolitics as the form of governing that power directly intersects with biological life. It actively intervenes

in people's lives, managing and directing them, as is evident in health care industry. The management of biopolitics—surveillance over biological lives—used to be one of the governmental imperatives. However, the duty has shifted to private companies and eventually passed down to citizens, who activate surveillance over their own lives. In other words, the government, at first, has created a circuit of managing people's lives by maintaining the task by itself. Then deregulation allows the market to interfere with people's physical and mental conditions through the existing route with much less responsibility. Now, unfulfilled responsibility as a burden falls on the shoulders of each individual who, in turn, is encouraged or required to monitor the dynamic relation between the market and their lives.

The first instance of neoliberal biopolitics is Corecktail, a special substance that controls the brain function of the recipient. The company that develops the drug emphasizes that it may have the possibility to cure specific disorders and rehabilitate the brains of prisoners; and they conclude that prisoners eventually would gain two choices: Corecktail or detention. The idea of Corecktail embodies the aspect of biopolitics, an active involvement with citizens' lives, governing and shaping them in a certain direction. Under the principle of neoliberalism, it is the market that leaks into the existing course and takes over the role of governmental management of people's health conditions. In *The Corrections*, Gary and Denise consider the Corecktail treatment on Alfred, who suffers from Parkinson's disease and dementia. However, this new technology, even though the presenter of the company refers to it as the most humane treatment, is still "caveat emptor" (237). He reminds the audience that the responsibility for unauthorized treatment would be owned by customers. The company paints the consumers as the ones responsible; neither the government nor the company but the clients should operate surveillance over how it would turn out. If their surveillance is deficient enough to cause troubles, all of the responsibility is ascribed to them.

The pharmacological corporations rely on, or expect, the untrained eyes of customers and hope for imperfection in their surveillance. Giovanni Rubeis, in "Liquid

Health. Medicine in the age of surveillance capitalism" (2023), points out that "[b]y individualizing health data collection and the responsibility for being and staying healthy, health becomes *socially exterritorial*, meaning that it emancipates from norms and institutions that hitherto defined it. The crucial point is that at the same time also the power relations that are built around health become both exterritorial and socially exterritorial, are freed from restrictions in space and time as well as established normative frameworks" (3). As for Coreck tall, its legal and ethical responsibility is placed on each consumer. It reveals the connection between biopolitics and neoliberalism; when the market resists the intervention of the government, it is allowed to take the role of management of private lives, but the circuit of the power relation is active without any responsibility. It finally passes over to civilians, and so does the function of surveillance in the market.

Similarly, the case of Enid, who consumes Aslan, an unapproved mood-altering substance, without recognizing it as illegal, exemplifies a citizen's failure to monitor the market. In *The Corrections*, she consults the doctor on the cruise ship about Alfred's symptom of hallucination. In the scene, it is notable that even though Enid first sees the doctor because of Alfred, she turns to be the customer of the substance that the doctor stealthily prescribes. The doctor explains to Enid as follows: "[a] lot of travelers consider it a more important investment even than cancellation insurance. With all the money you've paid for the privilege of being here, Enith, you have a right to feel your best at every moment. A quarrel with your spouse, anxiety about a pet you've left behind, a perceived snub where none was intended: you can't afford these bad feelings" (368). He recognizes Enid as a potential customer, advertising the supplement, which he calls "Personality Optimizer" (370), that could alleviate her depressed feeling. He also emphasizes that it has not gotten approval from the American regulatory system. If she would like more Aslan, she may have to participate in the cruise trip again or purchase Mexican Aslan out of the country. Later the Mexican Aslan the doctor refers to turns out to be just a sort of club drug; however, without any information, Enid chooses to obtain it. Similar to the presenter

of Corecktail, the doctor, the advertiser of Aslan, highlights that consumption is the client's opportunity. By taking advantage of deregulation, the industry deceives citizens who fail to gain accurate information through their market surveillance.

In operating domestic surveillance over Enid, Gary discovers the mother's consumption of the illegal drug, Aslan. Gary criticizes her and tries to confiscate it; however, Denise disapproves of it by responding, "[s]he's an adult and she can do what she wants" (565). It can be interpreted that she perceives Enid as a mature adult who is responsible for herself. However, in the context of market surveillance and neoliberalism, she states that Enid is already a mature consumer and entrepreneur, and she is responsible for the consequences of her own market surveillance. Under the neoliberal governance, all citizens are considered as *homo economicus*, self-entrepreneurs who hold responsibility for their socio-economic decisions and actions. Even in the scale of a family, this principle is deeply rooted in its relationships. However, Chip's business in Lithuania depicts the left circuit by the government that exists in an anarchic nation.

As well as the episode of pharmacology, Chip's business and experience in Lithuania also foreground the theme of neoliberal deregulation. Lithuania is depicted as a site of ultimate deregulation, of the imbalance between the market and the governmental control. After Chip has been fired from the university for having an inappropriate relationship with his student, he joins Gintanas, his ex-girlfriend's husband, in the business in Lithuania. Out there, Chip posts a fabricated story on a website to deceive investors by promising privileges to them, such as offering discounts on renting the national troops of Lithuania. When he receives the email from the media, he uses the term "Enlightened neotechnofeudalism" (506) as the next level of political economy. Living in Lithuania, he compares black-market Lithuania and free-market America: "[t]he main difference between America and Lithuania, as far as Chip could see, was that in America the wealthy few subdued the unwealthy many by means of mind-numbing and soul-killing entertainments and gadgetry and pharmaceuticals, whereas in Lithuania the powerful few subdued the unpowerful

many by threatening violence” (511). In Lithuania, as the government is totally dysfunctional, other private forces build their own institutions. For instance, oligarch Victor Lichenkev establishes “police” and puts it under his control. After comparing Lithuania and America, Chip concludes that there is not much difference. However, the significant difference is that for America, people are paralyzed by entertainment, gadgets, and medicines; on the other hand, Lithuania is controlled by violence and threats. This comparison of Lithuania in socio-political anarchy and the US in neoliberalism satirically highlights the absence of the government. Minimum interference of the government in the US with neoliberal policies coincidentally overlaps with the chaotic anarchy in Lithuania, where, due to the collapse of the government, the only element that is credible is the market and investment.

5. Conclusion

The Corrections is interpreted as a novel of family, where multiple layers of surveillance—where domestic surveillance, self-surveillance, and market surveillance—are practiced among the characters living under neoliberal conditions. In the Lambert family, domestic surveillance of parents over their children seems to be a common discipline for supervising. However, with neoliberal principles, the reversal in power relations between parents and children occurs as the children also function as homo economicus who create market values. As can be seen in Caleb's new hobby, children have become both the target and the performer of surveillance. On the other hand, Alfred, who gets too old to keep the ability as homo economicus, is finally released from the network of monitoring. Each one has been measured in terms of the market, and consequently the family relationship has become fragile.

As another form of surveillance, the practice of self-surveillance in Denise's relationships with the other characters has been discussed. As if applying Michel Foucault's theory of discipline in the Panopticon, Denise conducts surveillance over/into herself and disciplines herself in accordance with outer norms and expectations.

When she builds relationships with others, she always considers how she is seen by them, internalizes the outer gazes, and disciplines herself to fit into the expectations.

Also market surveillance by individuals as a result of the reduction of governmental control has been discussed. In the name of deregulation, the free market refuses to allow the government to intervene, then instead the citizens are the ones who monitor it by utilizing the left circuit of governmental surveillance. In *The Corrections*, the consumption of unapproved pharmaceuticals such as Corecktall and Aslan assume the characters' responsibility and decisions that are made with their surveillant attention and deliberation. Chip's business in Lithuania depicts the ultimate consequence of deregulation in an anarchy-like nation. Ultimately, *The Corrections* reveals how surveillance under the neoliberal logic are practiced among the family and other relationships, and shows how it forms and transforms the characters living in the age of neoliberalism.

Works Cited

- Annesley, James. "Market Corrections: Jonathan Franzen and the 'Novel of Globalization.'" *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, pp. 111–128. <http://inscribe.iupress.org/toc/jml/29/2>.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. Polity Press, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College De France, 1978–79*. Translated by Graham Burchell, edited by Michel Senellart, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Franzen, Jonathan. *The Corrections*. Fourth Estate, 2010.
- Leniarska, Aleksandra Zuzanna. "'He stopped to lower his window and say hello': Jonathan Franzen, Neorealism and De-politicized Communitarianism." *European Journal of American Studies*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2024. *OpenEdition Journals*, doi:10.4000/ejas/22040.
- Rubeis, Giovanni. "Liquid Health: Medicine in the Age of Surveillance Capitalism." *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 322, 2023, article 115810, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115810.
- Steger, Manfred B., and Ravi K. Roy. *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2021.