From the Editor
Pete Smith
University of Texas—Arlington

At IALL '97 this past Summer in Victoria, I had the plea-
sure of joining my colleagues and friends Ursula Williams,
Jan Marston, and Ed Bardwell in a panel discussion on the
role of technology in the teaching and appreciation of lan-
guage. The panel—"Monads, Monks, Missing Links, and
Multimedia: When Instructional Technology Fails"—evolved
from a discussion that Ursula and I had started over a year
before. During that time, we had been jointly discussing what
I might describe as a dispepsis we both felt with the world of
language technology. What was it that was *not* working in
our language labs and media centers? Is technology really the
be all and end all in language teaching?

As a language teacher, I hold steadfastly to the overriding
principle that words, beautifully shaped, shape lives. In this
vein, it is not enough merely to teach a grammar or expose
our learners to the now instantaneous stream of language to
which they have access via television, radio, satellite, and even
the World-Wide Web. It is not sufficient to reach only for com-
prehension or oral communicative competence as goals.
Where is the opportunity to stop, to consider, to appreciate
the beauty that is language and the insight that culture brings?
We typically save such appreciative approaches for advanced
undergraduate literature classes—courses which the vast
majority of language learners in the United States never reach.
Can we infuse all of language learning with the quiet joy we
all have experienced in a line from Roethke or Moliere? And
does technology really have much to offer learners striving to
contemplate that beauty?

*"For in the end, we as
language educators
have a dual role:
to lead our students
on a pilgrimage of
both knowing and of
loving."*

To know, the naturalist John Burroughs wrote, is only half;
to love is the other half. Although technology and the elec-
tronic media can support the work we do in the classroom,
they can never in and of themselves provide the inspiration
that we as teachers can offer. As a panel, I think we agreed
that ours is to not only to present material to language stu-
dents, but also to demonstrate a love for the language and

culture which we teach. Ours is to inspire the learners and scholars who come after us. And although technology will help us *motivate* students, it is we as teachers who *inspire*. The data behemoth that is the Internet may indeed prove to be the single greatest change to the way we as educators do business in the late 20th century. But one still can't stream inspiration on the 'net, and you can't fit love in a data packet.

For in the end, we as language educators have a dual role: to lead our students on a pilgrimage of both knowing and of loving. For without the "other" half, we allow language teaching to become merely a subject matter, perhaps worthy of several semesters of a college student's time, but for the most part not the stuff of life-long love and contemplation.

Several of the articles in this issue pick up on themes we raised at the "Monads" panel. With this number, we welcome Rachel Saury not only as our new Managing Editor, but also as a contributor. Her article on change and creativity in program implementation considers both the promise of technology and its "shadow side." Patricia Lamb, one of IALL's new Board members, considers core values for language media center employees as she discusses the human element in lab management. And Rachel and Patricia are joined by veteran *Journal* columnist David Pankratz and our newest columnist, Michael Heller. I hope that you find this issue of the *IALL Journal* as fascinating as I do!■