which different sections of the audience inhabit... the meaning of a text must be interpreted in terms of which set of discourses it encounters in any particular set of circumstances." (Cultural Transformations, in Language, Image, Media, 1983)

In the end, Chilton's project requires a greater indulgence in 'concrete' research as suggested by Morley's fruitful approach to media sociology. The "encountered sets of circumstances" and actual sites of linguistic negotiation need to be fully explicated. If Chilton expects his book to effectively challenge the hegemony of "nukespeak", then he must first and foremost shed an obsolete communications model which presumes, as he put it in another essay not in his collection, Words, Discourse and Metaphors (1985), that words are "planted in the head." What need to be additionally challenged are Chilton's own assertions that the producers of "nukespeak" do not intercommunicate with the consumers of "nukespeak", that the linguistically packaged arguments of the producers are to a significant degree uncritically assimilated by the consumers, and that the media are the distributors of a "nukespeak" commodity." (p. 54) The decisive step in dismantling "nukespeak" involves a categorical refusal to accept "nukespeak" as commodity.

Aside from these few critical remarks, this collection of essays should not be underestimated for in them Chilton carries out a most provocative and compelling discourse analysis of the linguistic parameters of the texts embodying the nuclear arms debate. This in itself contributes substantially to the "dismantling" of "nukespeak".

Reviewed by: Edward Renouf Slopek
McGill University

The Economics of Television: The U.K. Case

Can the market produce desirable television programming? In most countries outside the United States debate rages over this question. The Economics of Television: The U.K. Case is a contribution to the debate.

The book was written in response to the report of the Peacock Committee. The committee addressed the financing of the British Broadcasting Corporation, but its report went beyond this narrow mandate and provided an assessment of British broadcasting in general. The report also stressed the importance of consumer sovereignty and supported the role of the market in the area of broadcasting. At the risk of some simplification, it is possible to say the Peacock report presents the right wing, pro-market side of the debate on the market and television.

Given the background of the book—it was commissioned by the Greater London Council in its final days—and the sympathies of the authors as seen in some of their
previous work\textsuperscript{1}, it would be tempting to summarize \textit{The Economics of Television} as the left wing, anti-market side of the debate. Such a summary would be misleading.

In fact, one problem with the book is that there is no clear statement in it of the conclusions the authors wish to make. In the final paragraph of the book the authors state that they differ in their evaluation of the Peacock analysis and proposals—a rather stunning statement, given that the authors have joined forces to write a response to the Peacock report. The authors do agree, however, that the broadcasting market is imperfect and that a complete analysis of the issues raised by these imperfections would require a book on the politics of television in the U.K.

The book ends lamely with a silly, and not very original, statement from Peacock that "economic policy is too important a matter to be left to economists."

This ending is a pity. It almost nullifies—or at least calls into questions—the good work found in the rest of the book. In addition to examining the question of the financing of broadcasting, the authors address three issues: the nature of the television market, trends in broadcasting costs and the internationalization of television.

Any Canadian who has studied broadcasting will recognize the importance of these issues. The authors of \textit{The Economics of Television} are correct in suggesting that they have provided information that will be useful outside the time and place that provided the focus of their study.

In fact, Canadians will experience a sense of \textit{deja vu} while reading this book. The analysis of the BBC is at the centre of any study of U.K. broadcasting, just as the CBC is the focal point of any study of Canadian broadcasting. The BBC faces competition from independent broadcasters and, given advances in communication technology such as satellites and cable, from foreign broadcasters. Although the BBC is seen as the nation's cultural flagship, it buys foreign program to meet its competition. It is ironic that as many nations outside the U.S. worry about the effects of "wall-to-wall \textit{Dallas}," the BBC outbids its rivals and paid a record per-episode price for \textit{Dallas}. As the authors of \textit{The Economics of Television} document, it is still less expensive to buy an episode of \textit{Dallas} that to produce an hour of drama for television.

Attempts to curb the growing presence of foreign television in the U.K. have led to quotas on imported television programs and production aimed at overseas markets. Co-productions of British and foreign television companies are also used to broaden the market for television shows and finance shows that are, at least in part, British. (BBC co-productions have often given the BBC the dominant creative role, so these television shows are identifiably British and effectively reduce the foreign element on British television.)

The authors use what can be called an empirical approach, although they do not attempt any econometric, or rigorous statistical, testing of any hypothesis. There are
two reasons for ignoring such tests. Although the authors are excellent at assembling the available data, these data are unequal to the task. Unfortunately, the analysis is as piecemeal as the data. There are too many gaps and missing series for useful econometric work. Another reason for avoiding statistical tests is that the authors do not have a consistent model to test.

The lack of a consistent model follows in large measure from the author's distrust of economics. They seem to think that saying the market for television is imperfect ends the usefulness of an economic approach. This is not true. As the recent public choice literature stresses, the cost of any market imperfection must be compared with the cost of any imperfection caused by government intervention or regulation.

The Economics of Television is a flawed book, but one that is a step in the right direction—one that moves away from hand-waving assertions and emphasizes the importance of facts. The book will be of interest to those studying in the economics of television in Canada.

Reviewed by: Terrence J. Thomas
Research Branch
Library of Parliament

Notes
