



last years he spoke out on behalf of gay rights, and against the abuse of human rights in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. The skepticism of his philosophical account of personal identity and individuality made no difference to his political

rhetoric. . . . What positive conception he possessed of a less oppressive society remains mysterious."

Some of Foucault's admirers fear that Miller's book will have an unwholesome effect. It vividly demonstrates "why it is that whenever those of us who feel ourselves to be in Foucault's embattled position, or who share his political vision, hear those who don't do either invoke the notion of 'truth,' we reach for our revolvers," complains David M. Halperin, an English professor at MIT, in *Salmandi*. The idea of "truth," in his view, as in Foucault's, is only a tool of the oppressor.

Should Miller have refrained from reporting the seamier details of Foucault's life? "At issue here," notes *Dissent's* (Spring 1993) Richard Wolin, "is something much larger than how to understand Foucault's life and work—it involves a clash of world views. Poststructuralists, following Nietzsche, do not believe in something like 'the truth.' Instead, there exist only 'points of view' that are backed by determinate interests. . . . The poststructuralist standpoint invites an ominous practice: where 'truth'—however one chooses to define it—fails to coincide with the agenda of political radicalism, it should be suppressed. Yet, when truth becomes solely a matter of pragmatics or interest, as it was for Foucault . . . we risk losing the capacity to distinguish right from wrong, the just from the unjust, good from evil."

Will Televangelism Be Reborn?

"The Rise and Fall of American Televangelism" by Jeffrey K. Hadden, in *The Annals* (May 1993), the American Acad. of Political and Social Science, 3937 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.

Since the sex scandals of the late 1980s that brought down TV preachers Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart, evangelical religious broad-

casting seems to have gone into a tailspin. Whereas in 1986 more than 15 million households a week tuned in to religious broadcasts, by early 1992 only 9.5 million did. Contributions have fallen off sharply. Yet, says Hadden, a University of Virginia sociologist, "televangelism" may well rise again.

Before their recent decline, evangelicals dominated the religious airwaves for two decades. Passionately eager to proselytize, evangelical ministers did not hesitate to go on the air and plead for money to spread their message.

Most of their mainline Protestant and Catholic counterparts were reluctant, and they were gradually squeezed off the airwaves after 1960, when the Federal Communications Commission dropped its requirement that public-service air time be provided free of charge to churches and others.

Technological advances soon strengthened televangelists: Videotape made it possible to air a program in hundreds of cities at the same time, and satellite transmission permitted live broadcasting. Televangelists created new religious networks—Pat Robertson's Christian Broadcasting Network, Paul Crouch's Trinity Broadcasting Network, and Jim Bakker's PTL Network. Between the late 1960s and the mid-'80s, the audience for syndicated religious TV shows soared, from an average of about five million per program to nearly 25 million. Related ventures, such as cathedrals, universities, and theme parks, also flourished.

Then, in 1987, with the revelation of Bakker's past tryst with a church secretary, came the fall. Scandal was only part of the reason for evangeli-

cal broadcasting's decline, Hadden argues. The market already had become saturated. Televangelist Rex Humbard, for example, left the air in 1985 after the number of stations on which he appeared fell by 36 percent over 10 years. The televangelists' forays into politics also hurt. In 1985, when talk of a presidential bid by Pat Robertson started to be heard in public, Robertson's TV audience began to shrink. Even before the Jim Bakker scandal broke in 1987, the audience for *The 700 Club* had fallen by 21 percent over two years.

But the nimble entrepreneurs of faith have readjusted. Robertson, for example, restructured his Christian Broadcasting Network to present family-entertainment programs along with religious broadcasts. He also exploited cable television. By the end of 1991, his Family Channel reached 92 percent of all cable households in the country. In addition, the number of *local* religious TV stations has steadily grown, from 25 in 1980 to 339 in 1990. All in all, Hadden concludes, it is much too early to conclude that televangelism's run is over.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & ENVIRONMENT

Superfund: The Continuing Calamity

"Stop Superfund Waste" by Bernard J. Reilly, in *Issues in Science and Technology* (Spring 1993), Univ. of Texas at Dallas, P.O. Box 830688, Mail Station AD13, Richardson, Texas 75083-0688; and "Environmental Policy and Equity: The Case of Superfund" by John A. Hird, in *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (Spring 1993), John Wiley & Sons, 605 Third Ave., New York, N.Y. 10158.

The federal Superfund program was created in 1980 in the aftermath of the Love Canal scare as a \$1.6-billion effort to clean up the nation's abandoned hazardous-waste sites. It has since evolved into "an open-ended and costly crusade" that wastes money and fails to target the sites that pose the greatest risks to public health or the environment, argues Reilly, cor-

porate counsel at DuPont.

There are more than 1,200 sites on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) so-called national priority list, and more than 30,000 sites being considered for addition to the list. So far, fewer than 100 sites have been completely cleaned up. To do that for all of the 1,200 sites now on the priority list will cost an estimated \$32-\$60 billion, and much more if, as planned, the EPA adds 100 sites a year, at an average cost per site of \$27-\$50 million.

The legislation is intended to make the polluter pay the costs of cleanup, adds Hird, a University of Massachusetts political scientist. But that frequently fails to happen. The public often foots the bill. When a polluter is made to pay, moreover, it can be just a minor polluter. The courts have ruled that firms that contributed only a small portion of a dump's hazardous con-